This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Harvard College Library

BOUGHT FROM GIFTS
FOR THE PURCHASE OF ENGLISH
HISTORY AND LITERATURE

"SUBSCRIPTION OF 1916"

The Manx Society

ESTABLISHED IN THE YEAR

MDCCCLVIII

VOL. XXII.

DOUGLAS, ISLE OF MAN
PRINTED FOR THE MANX SOCIETY
MDCCCLXXIV

The Manx Society

ESTABLISHED IN THE YEAR

MDCCCLVIII

VOL. XXII.

DOUGLAS, ISLE OF MAN
PRINTED FOR THE MANX SOCIETY
MDCCCLXXIV

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
SEP 12 1916
SUBSCRIPTION OF 1916

N.B.—Members at a distance are requested to acknowledge their copies to the Honorary Secretary, Mr. PAUL BRIDSON, Atholl Street, Douglas, to whom also their subscriptions may be remitted.

President.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor.

Vice-Presidents.

The Hon. and Right Rev. Horace, Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man.
The Honourable Charles Hope.
James Gell, H.M.'s Attorney-General of the Isle of Man.
Ridgway Harrison, Receiver-General, Water-Bailiff, and Seneschal.
The Venerable Jos. C. Moore, Archdeacon.
Richard Jebb, Vicar-General.
J. S. Goldie Taubman, Speaker of the House of Keys.

Council.

Henry Cadman, Howstrake.
T. C. Callow, Douglas.
John F. Crellin, Orrysdale.
G. W. Dumbell, H.K., Belmont.
Wm. Farrant, Douglas.
Ed. Curphey Farrant, H.K., Ballakillinghan.
P. L. Garrett, Douglas.
William Gell, Douglas.
Samuel Harris, High Bailiff of Douglas.
Wm. Harrison, Rock Mount.
John M. Jeffcott, H.K., High Bailiff of Castletown.
Rev. Joshua Jones, D.C.L., Principal of King William's College.
Rev. W. Kermode, Vicar of Maughold.
Robert J. Moore, H.K., High Bailiff of Peel.
Wm. Fine Moore, H.K., Cronkbourne.
H. B. Noble, Villa Marina, Douglas.
Richard Sherwood, H.K., Douglas.
Rev. Theo. Talbot, Douglas.
T. Heywood Thomson, M.D., Michael.

Treasurer.

Paul Bridson, Douglas.

Hon. Secretaries.

Paul Bridson, Douglas.—John Goldsmith, Douglas.

Chronicon [illegible]

THE CHRONICLE OF MAN

AND

THE SUDREYS

G. & W. Waterston & Son. 14th. Edinr.

P. A. Munch.

CHRONICA REGVM MANNIÆ ET INSVLARVM.

THE CHRONICLE OF MAN AND THE SUDREYS

From the Manuscript Codex in the British Museum

WITH HISTORICAL NOTES

By P. A MUNCH

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF CHRISTIANIA,
HON. F.R.A.S.S.

REVISED, ANNOTATED, AND FURNISHED WITH ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS, AND ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF THE CHRONICA, AND OF THE LATIN DOCUMENTS,

BY THE RIGHT REV. DR. GOSS

VOL. I.

DOUGLAS, ISLE OF MAN
PRINTED FOR THE MANX SOCIETY
MDCCCLXXIV

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, *Edinburgh.*

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

	PAGE
PREFACE TO THIS EDITION	xi
MEMOIR OF PROFESSOR MUNCH	xxv
AUTHOR'S PREFACE	1
CHRONICON MANNIÆ ET INSULARUM	44
NOTES	123
INDEX TO NOTES OF PROFESSOR MUNCH . . .	261

PREFACE TO THIS EDITION.

I.—The Chronicle of Man.

The Chronicle of the Kings of Man is the earliest regularly digested account, yet discovered, of any portion of the history of the Island.

It was composed by a series of writers, inmates, to all appearance, of the monastery of Rushen, more or less contemporary with the events they narrate; and embraces the most important period of the existence of Man as a distinct kingdom, when its territory, including the Western Isles, was most extensive, and the share it took in the transactions of the day, was most considerable.[a]

Though commencing its record from the year 1000, the Chronicle does not make mention of the affairs of Man till the date of the battle of Stamford Bridge in 1066, when we are abruptly introduced to Godred Crouan, a fugitive from that memorable defeat of the Northmen, who is hospitably received by another

[a] Thus we read, Chron. A.D. 1075, that "Godred annexed Dublin, and great part of Leinster, and held the Scots in such subjection that none who built a ship or boat dare insert more than three bolts."

Godred, then king of the Island, and in a few years becomes occupant of the Manx throne. The fortunes of the kingdom under the dynasty of Godred Crouan form the principal subject of the subsequent narration.

The annals of the civil history close in 1316, when the male line of Godred had disappeared, and the right or power to dispose of the sovereignty was matter of contest between England and Scotland, the latter of which, in addition to her own previous pretentions, had purchased in 1266 the rights claimed by Norway during the preceding four centuries, as suzerain of the Western Isles, at that time called the Southern, Sudreyan, or Sodor Isles, in contradistinction to the Orkney, and other northern groups. The ecclesiastical history, given partly in the annals, partly in a separate short account of the successive bishops, is continued through another half century, and concludes with the installation of Bishop Duncan on the 25th of January 1376.

II.—Edition of Professor Munch.

Whilst the Chronicle forms the groundwork of Manx mediæval history anterior to the undisputed dependence of the kingdom on the crown of England, towards the close of the 14th century, the desultory form in which the events are frequently presented, combined with the shortness of the entire work, and the disproportionate length of particular descriptions and episodes, render the information it conveys meagre and fragmentary.

To supply this deficiency, by bringing the light of contemporary historical documents to bear upon the statements of the Chronicle, was the task undertaken by Professor Munch, a scholar eminently qualified for the work, by the bent of his mind, and the study he had made of Scandinavian antiquities.

The official records, civil and ecclesiastical, of the surrounding peoples, with their annals and other historical productions, especially the Sagas[a] of the Northmen and of their colonies; the ordinances and decisions of the Vatican;[b] a series of ethnological facts; and various monuments of olden time, still existing in the Isle of Man and the neighbourhood, supplied the professor with a large amount of precise history, and copious materials for the fruitful exercise of his great powers of direct, and of conjectural induction.

By the assistance of these sources of information, Munch not only shows how the fragments of the Chronicle may be framed into a continuous picture of

[a] A collection of these very important sources of Manx history, with translations and notes, would form a most interesting and appropriate continuation of Dr. Oliver's *Monumenta*, the first volume of which contains a few selections from these sources. Extracts from some of them were published by the Rev. W. Johnstone, in his *Antiquitates Celto-Scandicæ*, in 1786, but the book has become extremely rare. There are also some other original historical authorities referred to by Munch, from which it would be desirable to have, amongst those edited by the Manx Society, at least the passages which bear directly or indirectly upon the history of the Island.

[b] The learned and indefatigable historian, Father Theiner, archivist of the Vatican, had then lately published, from that collection of which he had charge, a large folio of documents relating to British history, entitled, *Vetera Monumenta Angliæ Hiberniæ et Scotiæ.*

the period, but endeavours, especially in his preface, and in notes 2d and 3d, to carry back the view through the two preceding centuries up to the reign of Harold Harfager, who established, about the year 870, the Norwegian power in the Western Isles. The matter thus supplied in the Christiania edition of the Chronicle is not woven into a history, but presented partly in a preface, and principally in a series of detached notes or dissertations, forming a commentary on the text, and constituting the second part of the volume, of which the third and last part is an Appendix, containing many of the documents to which reference had been made in the preceding parts. Some of these pieces have already appeared amongst those collected by Dr. Oliver in Volumes IV., VII., and IX. of the Manx Series, but the greater part are additional.

III.—Edition of the Manx Society.

This work, so necessary for the student of Manx history, having become extremely rare, and completely out of print, the Council of the Manx Society was desirous that a new edition should form one of their publications, and obtained, through the kind influence of the English Consul-General at Christiania, the consent of the University of that capital to the reprint. The preparation of the new edition was undertaken by the late Right Rev. Dr. Goss, who had been in the habit of passing some weeks during the summer in this part of his diocese, and occupying the time he

could spare from his official occupations in elucidating the history of the Island.[a]

A short statement will explain what has been attempted by Dr. Goss in preparing this new edition.

1. With respect to the *text* of Munch's edition, particular care has been taken to give it materially correct, as far as possible. The collation of the Latin text of the Chronicle, and of many of the documents in the Appendix, as given in the former edition, with that now presented, will show how necessary it was to pay attention to this point.

The *variantes* added by Dr. Goss below the Latin text, show the different manner in which the words of the only known MS.[b] have been read by various editors; especially in those cases in which the words in the

[a] Historical research had always great attractions for Dr. Goss. His contributions to the publications of the Cheetham Society bear testimony to his powers in the investigation of local lore. After his appointment to the See of Liverpool he collected from the archives of private families in the county, and from other sources, especially from the treasures of the new Record Office, the matter for some volumes of documentary addition to the ecclesiastical history of his diocese; amongst these are the pieces which he copied, with the kind permission of the High Bailiff, from archives in Douglas. At the time of his much lamented decease he was occupied in putting the last hand to this edition of the Chronicle. Whilst engaged in this work he had collected a considerable mass of materials for an ecclesiastical history of the Island, which he hoped to have leisure to complete at a later period, and for a corresponding civil history from the time of Harold Harfager.

[b] In addition to the description of this MS. given by Munch in the preface to his edition, many particulars will be found in Vol. IV. of our Series, to which Dr. Oliver has prefixed the facsimile of a page of the MS.

original have been abbreviated or corrected. These *variantes* will explain to a considerable extent the great discrepancy that may be observed between the various translations that have been made. It is true, as Munch remarks in his preface, p. 36, that many of the various readings appear to have arisen merely from want of experience or attention in the difficult task of deciphering old MSS.,[a] but in some places the signs employed to denote abbreviation, or the corrections made, or accidental strokes of the pen in the MS., render two very different translations possible, as at p. 62, in the last words of the entry for the year 1134.[b] The various readings given by Dr. Goss are those adopted by Johnstone in his *Antiquitates Celto-Normannicæ*, or by Dr. Oliver in Vol. IV. of this Series. A few of the more important ecclesiastical documents in the Appendix are furnished with *variantes* taken from sources which will be stated in the respective places.

2. *Translations* have been added of those parts of the work which were given in the Latin text alone, by Professor Munch in his edition. An English

[a] To the instances cited by Munch in a note, we might add an example from the Professor's own edition, p. 29 (p. 115 in this edition), where, in the account given of Bishop Michael, the word *mitis* is given instead of *meritis*, though the ordinary sign of contraction over the syllable *mi*, employed in the MS., is clearly written; and the word meritis, not mitis, is necessary for the usual construction of the clause.

[b] Considering the great interest that must be taken in the Chronicle by all lovers of Manx history, would it not be well to have a critical edition of it prepared by an expert, for one of the volumes of our Series? The pieces which accompany it in the MS. volume might be added, for they are to a similar purpose.

version of the Chronicle, and of some of the documents, had already appeared in preceding volumes of the Series, but on account of the difference between the Latin text accompanying those translations, and the Latin text presented in this edition, as well as for other reasons which may be seen from collating the translations, it was judged advisable to give new versions. The manner in which, throughout the Chronicle, and not unfrequently in the documents also, proper names of persons and places are modified, partly by the spelling having been accommodated to the pronunciation adopted by the writers, and partly by the attempt to Latinise them, renders it frequently very difficult to determine the corresponding modern appellation. When the present name could be clearly ascertained it is given in the translation, even though it be not the literal English form of the Latin appellation. In this respect, however, much still remains to be done, which Dr. Goss would probably have accomplished had he been spared for a longer time.

3. *Additional notes*, both to the text of the Chronicle and to the Commentary of Professor Munch, form the most distinctive feature of this edition.

The Norwegian editor remarks in his preface (p. 37), that he had sought to throw light on the Chronicle from the northern Sagas, and other national records, chiefly, whilst the explanations supplied by him from English, Scotch, or Irish authors, were "merely stray bits, which may no doubt receive large additions, or even corrections, from British authors."

To present a portion of the information to be drawn from the sources here indicated, especially from the learned investigations of recent editors of old records, is the principal object of the additional notes. In comparing the statements of Munch with those of other authorities, particular attention has been paid to verifying or modifying the *conjectural* explanations of events and connection of facts, which the Professor carries to a great extent.

4. *In the Appendix* a few documents have been added, amongst which are the two most important in the collection, one for the ecclesiastical, the other for the civil history. The first (No. 5) is the bull of Anastasius IV. in 1154, by which the See of Man was annexed to the province of Drontheim, in which it remained long after the suzerainty of Norway over Man had passed away. The second (No. 27) is the treaty of 1266, by which that suzerainty was sold to Scotland.[a] Four documents have been transferred from the second to the third part of the work, for the sake of uniformity.[b]

No. 53 belongs to a period later than that at which the Chronicle closes, but it has been given from

[a] This document had already appeared in the Appendix to Vol. IX. of the Manx Series; but it was considered advisable to repeat it in the present volume on account of its importance to the history, and the reference made in the notes of Munch to the details it contains. On all other occasions, when a document is cited which does not occur in Munch's edition, but is to be found in some volume of the Series, the document is not repeated, but the volume cited in which it appears.

[b] They are Nos. 3 and 4, from p. 76 (168 of this edition), and Nos. 6 and 13, from p. 90 (186).

the Theiner collection as a curious picture of the circumstances of the Island about that time.

5. Two indexes are given, one of the notes or dissertations of Professor Munch constituting the second part of the work; and another of the documents in the Appendix.

6. A sketch of the life of the author has been furnished by the kindness of E. Charlton, Esq., M.D., of Newcastle. The portrait is reproduced from that in the 1st Edition.

The annotations added in this Edition are distinguished by the brackets [ ] within which they are enclosed, whether given as distinct footnotes, or as a continuation of the footnotes of the former edition. The *titles* of the additional documents are placed within brackets both in the body of the Appendix and in the Index.

IV.—On the Materials for a History of Man.

In the Chronicle elucidated by the accompanying notes and documents will be found the materials required for a continuous history of the Island, civil and ecclesiastical, with considerable details of some portions from the middle of the 11th to the close of the 14th century. An outline also, though not always quite distinctly traced, of the civil history is carried back to the last quarter of the 9th century.[a]

[a] From the end of the 14th century a succession of official and other records furnishes abundant materials for a continuous history of the Isle of Man down to the present day, requiring merely the labour of collecting and arranging.

Besides, however, making this direct contribution to the principal object of the Society, the work is calculated to do good service by directing attention to the sources from which future industry may be confidently expected not only to prepare a more complete account of the events of the period above mentioned, but to extend the narrative into times much more remote.

For we can scarcely suppose that the store of northern records out of which Professor Munch has thrown so much light upon the Chronicle, has been exhausted. During the several centuries which elapsed between the first Scandinavian expedition to the West and the treaty of Perth, the history of the north-western parts of the continent of Europe is interwoven with that of Man and of the Isles. In a letter written last June,

The catalogue of the works published by the Manx Society shows how much has already been done towards forming a collection of these documents, as well as of those relating to earlier times, whilst the very small contributions as yet gathered for this purpose from the archives of the Island, and those of the Stanley family, appear to be evidence of the rich mines of information yet remaining to be worked. Towards the solution of many of the questions belonging to this later period, as yet imperfectly answered, especially of those relating to the ecclesiastical history of Man during the 14th and 15th centuries, we may look for no small additional assistance from the treasures of the Vatican, which have contributed so large a share of the documents already published; the cathedral archives of Drontheim which supplied the most important of the ecclesiastical documents (No. 5) in the Appendix, may be expected to contain other monuments of its archiepiscopal relations to Man, which continued till near the end of the 15th century; and the records of the English and Scotch Sees to which Man and the Isles were respectively subjected, when separated from each other and from Norway, may fairly be presumed to have a store of further supplementary details.

the Secretary of the University of Christiania most generously offers every assistance to our Society from the means at his command, and refers us to Copenhagen for ulterior research, because a large portion of the Norwegian documents have been transferred to that city.

Again, the notes of Professor Munch, and still more so those of Dr. Goss, bear testimony to the great extent to which we are justified in looking for the details of the history of Man in the ancient annals of Scotland, which had a closer connection with the Island, and one dating from an earlier period than that of the Scandinavians. But the critical study of those annals is only in its infancy; the greater part of the results of that study collected and put before us by Dr. Goss had not been published at the time of the death of the great Norwegian historian. The writer of a very interesting article, entitled "Celtic Scotland," in the *Quarterly Review* for July last, observes that "a rich harvest still remains for those who shall bring the requisite skill and perseverance to the task of reaping it. There are Gaelic manuscripts, not a few, lying still untouched in the Advocates' Library of Edinburgh, and elsewhere in Scotland, waiting only for competent hands to edit them. Great libraries on the Continent, and especially in Italy, are understood to be rich in Celtic treasures." May we not reasonably expect to find amongst these treasures some contributed by the great seat of learning established in the Isles, throwing light upon the dark period before

and during the first incursions of the Northmen, the very period when the monastery of Iona was most flourishing, and probably supplied Man as well as other places with the ministers of religion.

A parallel progress, made by Irish antiquarians within the last half century, in the discovery and illustration of ancient records, presents a similar ground for hope of a succession of new materials for the history of Man. A considerable portion of the slender acquaintance we already have with the early times of our island has been gleaned from Irish annals, which show that the circumstances of Man and the Western Isles, will ever be found entering as a necessary element into the narration of Irish affairs, during those days when Christianity was introduced into Man, and the first series of its bishops sent over from Ireland; when Skye and Man paid tribute to their sovereign the King of Ulster; when Argyll was colonised by the Dalriads; or later on, when the principalities erected by the Scandinavians in Ireland, and Man, and the North of England, were in constant relations of alliance or antagonism with one another.

A perusal of this work will show how far what has been observed with respect to Scandinavian, Scotch, and Irish probable sources of further information, may be applied to English and Welsh, Roman, and other records.

Again, Professor Munch makes important but not exhaustive use of the testimony found in the language, the sculptured monuments, the names, and the habits

of the Isle of Man, at various periods. The peculiarity of a large number of the names of saints and other persons, of parishes, churches, and other places, ought to prove of great use in tracing the ecclesiastical history of the kingdom through the annalists, biographers (especially the Bollandists), and other writers of general, and special church history.

There remains a class of witnesses to the events of ancient times in which the Island is peculiarly rich, namely, rude stone monuments. They as yet do not speak with sufficient clearness to be of much service to our history, but the great attention which is now being paid to their investigation in every quarter of the globe, would seem to be a guarantee that before long they will convey information such as they would afford if inscribed with names and dates.

When we see the large and ever increasing amount of information that has been collected in the volumes of the Manx Society during the few years of its existence, and the strong light that has been thrown on ours by the labours employed on cognate histories during the same period, it is surely not too much to expect that in a very few years more we shall be able to carry back a connected and fairly developed account of the affairs of the Island, at least up to the time of its conversion to Christianity; and that, viewed from this point, the details of the prospect beyond may be gradually unfolded.

G. E.

St. Edwards, Everton, Liverpool,
January 15, 1874.

MEMOIR OF PROFESSOR MUNCH.

THE historian of Norway, Peter Andreas Munch, was born in Christiania, on the 15th December 1810. His father had been at one time a teacher in the Military Academy at Christiania, but afterwards accepted a country curacy, and died in 1847 Capitular provost (dean) in Christiania. Munch was educated at the academical school at Skien, in Norway, and did not distinguish himself in classical learning. He had, however, hardly completed his twentieth year when his attention was attracted to the old records of his native land. In 1834 we find him already appointed, with the late Professor Keyser, to superintend the publication of the *Ancient Laws of Norway*, and with funds granted for the purpose, by the Storthing or Parliament of Norway. He proceeded in 1835 to Copenhagen, taking with him his newly-married wife, the daughter of a merchant at Laurvig in Norway. The years he spent at Copenhagen, at Lund, and at Stockholm, examining old MSS. and documents in the libraries, were, he often said, the very happiest of his life. He was young, hopeful, and perfectly indefatigable in research, and was gifted too, with that rare sagacity in the valuing of documents and records, which characterises none but the thoroughly judicious historian. In 1837 Munch was made reader in history in the University of Christiania, and Professor of that chair in 1841.

He now became deeply engaged in preparation for his great work, *The History of Norway*, at which he laboured unceasingly during the last twenty years of his life. In 1846 he visited Normandy, and spent a considerable time in Paris; and again, in 1849, he was in Edinburgh, and extended his researches to the Orkney Islands. It was during his stay in Edinburgh that he discovered, and afterwards published, a short MS. *Historia Norvagiæ*, and transcribed numerous letters and documents relating to the early history of Orkney and Shetland. In England he examined the MS. of the text of the *Chronicon Manniæ*, which he edited in 1860, with the addition of most important notes from sources previously almost unexplored.

While engaged in compiling his History of Norway, Munch felt deeply how imperfect was the knowledge of the geography of his native land. The vast plateaux of the Norwegian Fjelds was almost unknown, save to a few hardy hunters. Munch spent his holidays in the recreation of accurately mapping out the wild districts between the Hardanger and Tellenacken, and so well did he organise his staff that a short period sufficed to produce the excellent map of Norway so well known to travellers. In 1855 Munch was in Drontheim, for the purpose of studying the noble old Cathedral, about which he had already written so much. The text to the magnificent illustrated work on Drontheim Cathedral, published about 1859 by the Norwegian Government, was written by Munch, both the original Danish, and the English version, and it is hard indeed to detect that the latter is not the work of an Englishman. As a specimen of English correctly written by a foreigner, it is perhaps unrivalled.

As a Runologist, Munch had not, we think, an equal in all Europe. His observations on the early Runic alphabet, his notes on the Runic Stone of Tune, and on the remarkable Runic inscriptions in the Isle of Man, are only surpassed by

his elaborate disquisition on the Maeshowe Runes, which he published only the year before his death. A more cautious and less fanciful interpreter of Runes we never met with. Munch always advocated and enforced the simplest rendering of these short inscriptions, and blamed those who ever sought for recondite meanings in these mystic-looking letters.

Not contented with the documents he had obtained in the libraries of northern Europe, Munch determined, about the year 1856, to proceed to Rome, and search the Archives of the Vatican for materials for his history. The close relation between Scandinavia and the Vatican in ancient times, was well known to the historian, but very few of the important papers relating to Norway had been transcribed. A general idea prevailed that it was impossible for a foreigner, and above all for a Lutheran, to gain access to the wondrous stores in the Vatican Archives.

Munch's perseverance overcame all obstacles, and by the assistance of Cardinal Rauscher and Father Theiner, he was allowed not only to have transcripts, but to search for himself all through the treasured papers. In Rome, Munch was busily engaged for a long time. He left his family there, while he returned for a visit to Norway; and had once more returned to Rome to re-conduct his family to Christiania, when he was seized with his fatal illness in May 1863. He rallied for a week or two, but all hope of work was gone; and on the 25th of May 1863, another attack of apoplexy closed the scene. His great work was thus unfortunately left incomplete, ending with the close of the 14th century.

The great characteristics of Munch's mind were untiring industry and truthfulness. He was the very opposite to some antiquaries, and even historians; he abhorred a brilliant fiction, and many a cherished tradition of the North fell before his unsparing pen. His literary activity was enor-

mous; few men, even in these productive days, have written so much; much fewer indeed, have written so well. Norway may well be proud of her great historian, philologist, runologist, and antiquary. Rarely have such talents and so much industry and rectitude been combined in a single individual.

E. C.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE islands on the West Coast of Scotland and England occupy an important place in the earlier pages of Norwegian history, not only because of their having been, for about 170 years at least, if not for double that time, a part of the Norwegian kingdom, but also, because in the period when Norway itself was consolidated into one monarchy, and numbers of its citizens, disgusted with this new state of things at variance with their ideas of freedom and independence, sought new homes in foreign parts, these islands became, as it were, a kind of first *rendezvous* or central place, whence afterwards the emigrants themselves or their descendants in the first and the second degree, spread in various directions to form new settlements, never, however, ceasing to feel themselves Norwegians, but carrying with them everywhere the language, manners, and institutions of their original home, and always keeping up a connection with the mother country, which generally, when stronger powers from without did not interfere, sooner or later ended in real dependency or political union. We know this at least to be the case with Iceland, the most important and interesting of all Norwegian settlements, the history and manner of whose colonisation is accurately known from the *Landnámabók*.[a] If we study this

[a] [This book contains an account of the settlement of the Norwegians in Iceland. It was commenced by Aré Thorgilson, surnamed Frode or the Wise, who was born A.D. 1068 and died A.D. 1148. A Latin translation of the original Icelandic was published at Oxford A.D. 1716.]

remarkable work thoroughly, we shall find, that of the four hundred chief settlers, who divided the whole Island amongst them, the greatest, or most powerful, or those who carried the largest families with them, did not come immediately from Norway, but from the Western Islands, whither they first made sail when emigrating from their ancient udal[a] possessions in the old country. And even as to those, about whose fates during the time between their emigration from Norway and their arrival in Iceland nothing is told expressly, it is still somehow to be guessed that they passed some time in the Western Islands, or in Ireland at least, in the first period of the colonisation.[b] We find, thus, that not a few of their slaves had Gaelic names, which shows that they were either Irishmen or Scottish Highlanders[c]; some of the settlers themselves were even Irishmen, or inhabitants of the western coasts of Scotland[d]; and what is still more remarkable, and,

[a] [By udal or odall possessions are meant untaxed freeholds to which the possessor succeeded by hereditary right, or by right of blood.]

[b] We distinguish between two chief periods of emigration to Iceland, the first immediately after the conquest of the whole of Norway by Harold Hárfagri, the second in his later days, or in the second or third generation afterwards, when the soil of Iceland had already for the most part been divided between the first settlers, and the more recent comers were obliged to buy their lands. [The naval battle of Hafursfiord, fought A.D. 885, was a struggle between monarchy and aristocracy, between the sovereign power and a multitude of independent States. Victory, after a hard contest, declared for Harold, and the jarls and native chiefs, who refused to submit, were driven into exile; some preferring liberty voluntarily exiled themselves. From this year may be dated the colonisation by Norwegian settlers of the Orkneys, the Hebrides, the Shetlands, the Feroes, and Iceland; the depredations on the coasts of Great Britain, and Ireland, and Spain; the invasion of Russia and Normandy by successful hordes of pirates, who considered a piratical life their proudest calling.—Dunham's *Denmark, Sweden, and Norway*, vol. i. 173-5. See also Robertson, *Scotland under her Early Kings*, vol. i. pp. 42 and 45.]

[c] As *Malcolm* (Mælkólfr), *Duthac* (*Dufpakr*), etc.

[d] Among those are named Calman, and his brother Cuilen (Kylen) from the Isles, who settled near *Hvita*, in the south-western part of the country, where the estate occupied by the former still bears his name—*Kalmanstunga*. Other

perhaps, gives the best evidence of the state of things here supposed, is, that the rearing and pasturing of sheep, the national and most important branch of livelihood in Iceland, has never, not even in the times of the colonisation, been like to anything in Norway, the mother country, not even as far as regards the nomenclature; while, on the contrary, it has all the chief and characteristic features of the same national occupation in Western Scotland and the Isles. From this circumstance we are indeed justified in concluding, almost to a certainty, that those settlers, who set the first example of rural economy in Iceland, and gave to the whole way of living its chief and lasting features, had lived long enough on the Scottish coasts and the Isles, to become in a great measure nationalised there, and to adopt very much of the manners and customs prevailing among the inhabitants. Nor is it to be forgotten that very likely the greater part of their servants, as already hinted, were natives of these countries, and that no doubt to their care the chief arrangement of the household was confided. To the Icelanders, therefore, the Western Islands of Scotland, as in a certain degree the chief cradle of their race even more than the mother country Norway itself, ought to be of peculiar interest, and should be looked upon by them with a sort of filial piety.

Iceland, however, is not the only Norwegian settlement to which the Western Islands have been, as it were, a kind of stepping stone. As for Ireland, that is to say the Norwegian settlements and kingdoms at Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick, we would affirm this at once as a matter of course, if the proximity of Ireland and the Islands did not make it likely that both of them were visited by our ancestors at the same time, and settlements formed simultaneously on either side of

names among the settlers, or their first descendants, sufficiently showing the Gaelic origin of the bearers, are Connal (*Konall*), Nial (*Njáll*), Becan, Melpatrick, etc.

the sea. Yet, as the Islands were situated on the way of the Norwegians to Ireland, and therefore likely to be visited by them before the latter, although it seems to us evident, as shall be shown hereafter more circumstantially, that the Islands did not, at any period, contain large and lasting colonies, but rather an uncertain and fluctuating population of Norsemen, while in Ireland these became stationary for centuries, we think ourselves entitled to regard the Irish colonies as subsequent to, and chiefly issuing from, the first settlements made by Norwegians in the Isles west of Scotland. From both, the Isles as well as Ireland, or perhaps chiefly from the former, the Isle of Man evidently got its Norwegian population, which, however, although strong enough, as we shall see, to leave many traces, even in the local denominations, did never, as in the Orkneys and Shetland, entirely absorb the Gaelic population,[a] which shows that this island was likewise more a stepping stone for other settlements on a larger scale, than such a settlement itself. And here it is not difficult to trace the direction which the flood of Norwegian emigrants took after resting for a while on Man. From the middle of the ninth century, the eastern coasts of England,[b] from East Anglia

[a] [The Rev. Isaac Taylor (*Words and Places*) says, "that the map of the Island contains about four hundred names, of which about twenty per cent are English; twenty-one per cent are Norwegian; and fifty-nine per cent are Celtic of the most Erse type."]

[b] [A.D. 787 the Saxon Chronicle mentions the first appearance of the Danes or Norwegians on the coast of England. In 795 Irish and Welsh annals mention their appearance in the Irish seas. In 798 they invade the Isle of Man. In 807 they appear on the mainland in Ireland, plundering Innis-Murray, County Sligo, and Innis-Bofin, County Mayo. The atrocities which they committed in their inroads are beyond description, but the monasteries and churches were the especial objects of their pagan fury. They left nothing that they did not ravish, nor a cave underground that they did not explore. The cruelties they inflicted when opposed may be learned from their treatment of Ælla, who had the misfortune to fall into their hands alive. His ribs were divided from the spine; his lungs were drawn through the opening, and salt was thrown into the wounds. At Medes tede the women and children

to the Scotch border, had been subjected to an incessant visitation by Vikings or emigrants from the *Danish* countries, belonging, it is true, to the same chief stem of nationality, as the Norwegians, but forming nevertheless a separate branch, with peculiarities characteristic enough to distinguish them from these. We suppose it to be known by every student of English or Northern history, and deem it therefore unnecessary to be dwelt upon at length here, how these Danish emigrants

who had sought refuge in the abbey were massacred; and Ubbo, their chief, with his own hand, slaughtered the abbot and eighty-four monks. The nuns of the convent in the Isle of Ely, who were descended from the noblest of the Saxon families, were sacrificed to their lust and cruelty, and the sacred edifice, with every other building within the range of this devastation, was devoured by the flames. In Ireland they committed similar atrocities, sparing neither the sanctuaries of God nor the abodes of man. A native writer complains that they ravaged her chieftainries, demolished her churches, rent her shrines, and drowned her books, and made sword-land and spoil-land of her provinces. Her people, old and young, men and women, clergy and laity, were alike exposed to indignity, outrage, and oppression. Nay, if there were but one milk-cow in the house, it could not be milked "for an infant of one night, nor for a sick person," but must be kept for the foreigner billeted upon them, who did not hesitate to kill the cow "for the meal of one night," if his wants could not otherwise be supplied.

Various causes have been assigned for the emigration of the Northmen. The law of succession, which gave all to the eldest son, drove the younger sons to seek a livelihood and fortune by piracy, for which their country, with its rivers, firths, and bays, was highly favourable. Besides, it was easier and more pleasant to live by plunder than by work, and the unproductiveness of their own soil led them to seek a home in the sunnier regions of the south, where nature was more lavish of her gifts. Until the reign of Harold Hárfager, the excursions of the Northmen had been generally confined to the passing attacks of adventurers, who, having swept the country of everything they could lay hands upon, returned home with their booty at the close of their summer's cruise. But when that King had changed the proprietary nobles into tributary tenantry by depriving the Bonders of their odal right, and compelling them to pay land-tax to the King, the malcontents thronged in multitudes as permanent settlers, accompanied by their wives and children. — Robertson, vol. ii. p. 300. *Illustrated Hist. Ireland*, 149-157. Ling. *Hist. Eng.*, vol. i. pp. 183-187. Todd's *Wars of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, pp. 41-43. Dunham's *Denmark, Sweden, and Norway*, vol. i. pp. 276-320.]

at last succeeded, not only in subjugating a large portion, almost the north-eastern half of England, but also in introducing their language and nationality, and in establishing kingdoms, one of which lasted for a couple of generations, and even after having submitted to the kings of England, continued still for a long time to form a separate part of the empire, with the laws, institutions, and to a great extent even the language imparted to it by the powerful warriors from the shores of the Cattegat and the Belt.[a]

For a long time no distinction was made between these northern settlers on the east coast of England and the Norsemen in Ireland and Scotland, but they were named indiscriminately Danes or Normans, and were generally looked upon as belonging to one people. The more accurate study and knowledge of the old German dialects, however, begun and carried out by the great scholars of our times, which have led to so many important ethnographical discoveries, unknown to and unlooked for by the linguists and ethnographers of the last century, have sufficiently pointed out the peculiar distinctions, however slight, between the two sister branches just mentioned, the Norsemen and the Danes, in the ninth and tenth century, and have enabled us to trace, in the north-western and more mountainous districts of the Danish settlement in the north of England, an influx of the Norwegian branch, from the shores of the Solway down to the eastern slope. And, indeed, no more than this fact is needed to show, that from the nucleus of Norwegian settlements in the Isles and Ireland, numbers of warriors poured over to the coasts of Cumberland, until at last they met with their Danish brethren, and then, with a nationality almost identical, and having interests in common with them against the former possessors of the soil, easily coalesced with them into one political and national body. It is the

[a] For more minute and accurate information about this matter I refer to Mr. Worsaae's *Danes and Norwegians in England.*

merit of Mr. Robert Fergusson to have first pointed out this important fact to English readers, in his valuable book, *The Northmen in Cumberland and Westmoreland;* while formerly, as just mentioned, no distinction was made between the Norwegian and Danish settlers in England, or if even some names characteristic of Norwegian nationality were pointed out, still the Norwegians were believed to have arrived together with, or from the same direction as, the Danes. Mr. Fergusson has not only given many local names,[a] which may be recognised at first glance as exclusively Norwegian, in the north-western part of Northumberland and the north of Cumberland, but has also collected a list of words,[b] still used in the dialects of those parts, the Norwegian origin of which is not to be mistaken.

This result from merely linguistic researches is also entirely confirmed by historical records, to which in a certain degree it affords the explanations hitherto wanting. Among the Northumbrian kings named in the so-called *Chronicon Saxonicum*, and by the old English annalists, we find several who are said to have arrived from Ireland, and whom, indeed, we find in the Irish chronicles as kings of Dublin—viz. Olaf Kvaran, one Sigtrygg (Sitric), etc.[c] In the celebrated battle of Brunan-

[a] Natland, Morland, Birkthwaite, Micklethwaite, Seathwaite, Applethwaite, Rugthwaite, Blea Fell, Dun Fell, Hest Fell, all in the lake district of Cumberland, which are identical with the Norwegian Natland, Morland, Birkethveit, Myklethveit, Siothveit, Eplethveit, Rugthveit, Bleefjeld, Dunfjeld, Hestfjeld.

[b] As—*amell* (ámilli), *Arvel* (erfi-öl), *bain* (beinn, *i.e.* straight), *batten* (batna—to improve, thrive), *beel* (belja), *boun* (búinn), *fleer* (flíra, *i.e.* sneer, laugh), *force* (fors, *i.e.* waterfall), *gowk* (gaukr), *gowl* (gaula), *gowpen* (gaupn, *i.e.* handfull), etc.

[c] [Olave Cuaran, or Olave of the *Sandal*, called also Olave the Red, and Olave Sitricson, was King of Dublin and Northumbria. He ruled the Irish Norsemen of Dublin for nearly 30 years. In A.D. 941 he was chosen King of Northumbria, and obtained the sovereignty of all the provinces on the north of the Watling Street. In 943 he was baptised, King Edmund acting as god-

burgh, Irish warriors are expressly stated to have fought; and in the beautiful old English poem describing it, the beaten warriors from Ireland are said to have returned to Dublin.[a] Here, then, it is easy to see that Man has formed the stepping-stone, and that the possession of it must have been of the utmost importance to the Norwegian warriors, who came here partly to form new settlements, partly to earn fame and booty by piratical exploits.

Even for Norsemen, who made their final settlements farther from the Scottish islands, these may be traced or at least supposed to have formed a favourite and much frequented haunt in the beginning of their career. It may now be regarded as pretty well ascertained that the chief bulk of northern settlers who occupied Normandy belonged to the Danish branch, but were called Nortmen or Normans, because they issued originally from the southern part of Jutland, while still ruled by kings of Norwegian origin, and even sometimes called Nortmannia. Rollo or Gangu-Rolf, the son of the Norwegian Earl Ragnvald, did not succeed to the command of the whole fleet or union of piratical emigrants till more than a generation after it had for the first time left the shores of the

father; but whatever his faith, his acts were pagan, especially in Ireland, to which he retired. After a vain attempt to reinstate himself in Northumbria, he finally settled in Dublin; but his power was broken at the battle of Tara against Malachy II., and his expulsion from Dublin ended, in the language of the native chronicler, "the Babylonian captivity of Ireland, inferior only to the captivity of hell." Broken in spirit, the aged warrior sought rest in the seclusion of Iona, where, after penance and good conduct, he died A.D. 981. Sitric Silkiskegg, or Silk-beard, his son, succeeded him at Dublin, and practised the lesson of war, bloodshed, and pillage, taught him by his father. He went to Rome in 1028, and returned the same year. He died in 1042, probably in religious retirement. See Robertson, vol. i. pp. 60-74. Todd's *Wars of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, appendix D., pp. 280-290.]

[a] [The poem is given in Anglo-Saxon and Latin by Johnson, *Antiq. Celto-Scandicæ*, fol. 54; we give in the Appendix 54 the translation from *Chron. Sax.* edited by B. Thorpe, vol. ii.]

Eider. But as a Norwegian, and a powerful one too, Rollo had no doubt frequented the Scottish isles and shores in his youth, before joining the great Danish fleet from *Nortmannia*. And there is an evidence thereof in the fact, that in the aforesaid *Landnáma*, a daughter of the same Rollo is mentioned, named Kathleen, who was, again, married to, or had a daughter by, the Scottish, or perhaps rather Irish king Beolan, at a time when Rollo must have been very young.[a] The name *Kathleen*, and her marriage with Beolan, is enough to prove that she must have been born and lived in Ireland, or somewhere in the Isles, and that it was here Rollo became acquainted with her mother. And Rollo was certainly not the only Norwegian among the Normandy settlers who had begun his emigrating career with an expedition to the Isles of western Scotland.

As for the Orkneys, Shetland and the Færeys, their proximity to Norway makes it more likely that they were peopled immediately from this country than by Norsemen previously settled in the Western Islands. Yet that even there many of the colonists may have belonged to the latter class is probable, at least from the circumstance that the general road to Iceland in the oldest times lay by these different groups of islands, each of them being about a day's sail from the other, and thereby enabling the sailors conveniently to shape their course. It is expressly stated of Aude, daughter of Ketil Flatnef (of whom more anon), head of the noblest and most powerful family who settled in Iceland, that she took this course, leaving one grand-daughter in Orkney, married to the Earl or Maormor of Caithness,[b] another at the Færeys.

[a] Landnáma II. 11. The daughter of Beolan and Kathleen, it is said, was ravished in Scotland by the Icelander Helgi, who married her, and had by her a son, whose daughter Gudrun was born about 960; Kathleen, then, was born about 880.

[b] This grand-daughter, married to Duncan Earl of Caithness, was named *Gróa*, which name has been rendered *Gruach* in Gaelic records. It is very

In these last-named islands, moreover, we find the same culture of sheep, characteristic of Scottish influence, as in Iceland. We know, even, that the sheep there are, or were, of the Scottish race, as Dicuilus tells us that about thirty years before the Norwegian emigration the islands had been inhabited by some Scoto-Irish Culdees,[a] who brought sheep with them, but were compelled to flee through fear of the northern Vikings. These sheep, multiplying to an enormous number, afterwards gave to the Islands their present name, *i.e.* Sheeps Islands.

The history of the Norwegian settlements in the Western Isles is but shortly and superficially told in our ancient Sagas. When it is said that they were colonised by emigrants, discontented with king Harold's strong rule, this is only partly true, for we learn from the Irish annals that Vikings from

probable that from this Gruach, and her husband Duncan, the far-famed Gruach, Macbeth's Queen, was descended, and had got her name. [The wife of Macbeth was the daughter of Boedhe, the son of Kenneth III., who is thought to have come to his death by violence at the hands of Malcolm II., that no rival might exist to his grandson Duncan I. Macbeth through his wife, the Lady Gruach, held a claim to the throne as heir to Kenneth III., and this claim he made good by the assassination of Duncan "in the smith's bothy," near Elgin, and succeeded to the throne of Scotland in 1040.—Robertson, vol. i. pp. 110 and 121.]

[a] Dicuilus de mensura orbis terræ, ed. by Letronne, pp. 38, 39. [Dicuil, a pupil of Suibne, was an Irish monk who, in 825, wrote a treatise on the measurement of the earth, based on a manuscript containing the measurement of the Roman Empire under Theodosius, with extracts from Solinus, Orosius, and Isidore, and the verbal recitals of travelled monks whom he had discoursed with. His work was published at Paris in 1807 by Walckenaer, and again in 1814 in a much superior way by M. Letronne. The word *Culdee*, writes the Right. Rev. Dr. Moran, the learned author of "*The Early Relations of Ireland with the Isle of Man*," and various works on Irish ecclesiastical history and antiquities, is an equivalent for the Irish word *Céle* a friend or a servant, and *De*, genitive of *Dia*, God. It represents the Latin expression *servus Dei* (servant of God) which was in general use for a person who followed the monastic life. In the early Irish it was used to designate members of the secular as well of the regular clergy. For a full account, see Dr. Reeves "On the Culdees," in *The Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xxiv. 1864.]

the north showed themselves there, and made depredations, as far back as 793.[a] Yet it is very probable that the chief influx of emigrants came in the time of king Harold, especially in the first half of his long reign, when his conquests were newly made, and when, indeed, also the emigration to Iceland became frequent. All the Sagas which mention these events agree in this point, that the discontented emigrants, who had assembled in the Western Islands as well as in the Orkneys and Shetland, did at last feel themselves strong enough to take revenge, running over to Norway and ravaging its coasts, thereby compelling king Harold to make a great expedition personally to the western seas, in which he conquered Orkney, Shetland, the Western Islands, and even Man, thereby establishing for the first time the dominion of Norway in these parts, and leaving an hereditary claim upon them to his descendants. But they do not agree in the particulars. Some of them say that Harold left the powerful Norwegian Ketil Flatnef (flat-beak) as his lieutenant there, but that afterwards Ketil threw off his allegiance;[b] others, that Ketil, having emigrated from Norway in disgust with the conquests of Harold, took up his abode in the Sudreys, whither the greatest part of his relations and friends soon repaired, and where he died.[c] This is the more likely version of the two, and as the tale that Ketil really exercised some authority in the Islands, does not appear to be unfounded in tradition, it is to be supposed that he established his authority, or succeeded in gaining to himself a lordship there in opposition to king Harold, which supposition is strongly confirmed by the fact that his daughter, the above mentioned Aude, was married to the cele-

[a] A.D. 793, it is related in the Ulster annals that the pagans ravaged all the islands of Britain; in 794 (or, according to other Chronicles, in 795) they devastated Rachrin; in A.D. 801 (or, according to others 797, 806) they burned the sacred buildings at Iona.

[b] Landnáma II. 15. [c] Laxdœla Saga.

brated *Olaf* the *White* (Amh-*labh*), the first Norwegian king of Dublin († c. 872).[a] The circumstance, however, that nearly all those friends or relations of Ketil left these parts for Iceland, where even his own daughter Aude, after the fall of her son Thorstein the Red, finished with taking up her abode, shows that they could not resist the power of Harold, who, as it is expressly told, appointed an earl as his lieutenant in the Isles, named *Tryggvi*, and, when Tryggvi was killed, another, named *Asbjörn*, with the surname of *Skerjablesi*. This Asbjörn, however, was likewise killed, by two relations of Ketil Flatnef, as shall be mentioned hereafter. Whether Asbjörn got a successor or not is not mentioned; we are rather inclined to believe that in the later times of king Harold's reign, when his sons made war among themselves, and still more after his death, the allegiance of the Sudreys became very slight, or was entirely thrown off; there is at least no mention to be found that king Hácon the Good, the son of Harold, although a powerful and enterprising monarch, did ever receive tribute or homage from these islands. Or, if the dependency was enforced, this was rather done by the powerful Earls of Orkney, who, being nearer at hand, might easier do it, and indeed, as will be seen from our Notes to the Chronicle, for some time at least held the islands, or part of them, as an *arriere fief*. For these subsequent events, we refer the reader to our notes; here it was our intention only to show the foundation of the Norwegian power in these parts.

It may, however, convey a clear idea of the manner in which our unruly forefathers visited, dwelt in, and left these

[a] [Olave the White and Ketil the Fair had formerly been rivals. Ketil had established himself in independence amongst the islands along the western coasts of Scotland belonging to the mixed Scandinavian and Gaelic race. He appears to have succeeded Godfrey MacFergus, who died A.D. 853, without, however, transmitting his power to his descendants; for his sons settled in Iceland after the expedition of Harfager, when the Isles fell into the hands of Scottish and Irish Vikings.—Robertson, vol. i. pp. 44-56.]

Islands during the unsettled times of the emigration, if we trace here in a few fragmentary lines the deeds and wanderings of the most prominent among those warriors who frequented them, as they are told in the Sagas, especially the Landnáma. These tales may also serve for a supplementary addition to our notes affixed, containing the beginning of the earlier history of the Norwegians in the Isles, while the latter contain the continuation.

We begin with the family of the above-mentioned Ketil Flatnef. That he had been in the Sudreys and enjoyed a great reputation long before the expedition of Harold, about A.D. 870, is clear, from the circumstance, that the fall of Thorstein, the Red, the son of his daughter Aude and king Olaf the White, must, according to the best calculations, have taken place about A.D. 874, who, as he then left several children, cannot have been born (and consequently the marriage between his father and mother contracted) later than about 852, when Olaf conquered Dublin ;[a] at this time, therefore, Ketil Flatnef must already have visited those parts, if, indeed, Olaf did not marry his daughter in Norway. But even if it were so, we may at least conclude from such a fact that a close connection existed for many years between Ketil and the powerful Norwegians in the west. Ketil was a son of the mighty baron Björn Buna, in the province of Sogn, in Norway, and had two brothers, named Hrapp and Helgi. He had two sons, Björn and Helgi Bjóla (a surname adopted, as it seems, in the west), and several daughters, of whom Aude, called the deep-wealthy,[b] the wife of king Olaf, has been already mentioned.

Both of Ketil's sons settled finally in Iceland. Helgi went first, it seems directly from Norway, and occupied vast

[a] [Olaf, says the Saga, was a Viking, who harried on the western lands, and conquered Dublin and Dublinshire, in Ireland, when he became king.]

[b] [I have seen the epithet in the Thorfinn Karlsefne Saga, translated Aude, the thoughtful deep-minded.]

districts in the south-western part of the country. Björn sailed first to the Sudreys or Scotland, where his relations were already established, but finding that they had all embraced Christianity, he felt so annoyed, that he followed the example of his brother, and took up his abode on the large peninsula protruding from the western coast of Iceland. His sister Aude, after the decease of her husband, king Olaf,[a] followed her son, Thorstein the Red, to Scotland, where, in company with Sigurd the first Earl of Orkney, he conquered Caithness, Sutherland, Ross, and Moray, and continued to rule for some time, until the Scotchmen rebelled, and killed him about A.D. 874.[b] Aude[c] then went with his children and the whole band of his followers to Orkney, where she stayed, as it appears, for a longer time, until the greater part, at least, of her grand-children were grown up. It has been already mentioned that she married one of her daughters, Groa, to Duncan, Earl of Caithness.[d] From Orkney she proceeded to the Feroe Islands, where likewise she married one of her grand-daughters, and from there to Iceland. Having suffered shipwreck near the abode of her brother Helgi, she repaired to him, but as he invited her only with the half of her company, she left him, disgusted with what she called his meanness, and went to her

[a] [Olaf fell in battle in Ireland.]

[b] [After a successful career, Thorstein perished by treachery, being betrayed by the Scots, and slain in battle A.D. 875. Jarl Sigurd, his ally, came to his death in a singular way. He had slain, in single combat, Mallvide "with the buck-tooth," and, cutting off his head, hung it in triumph from the saddle-bow, in which position the projecting tooth inflicted so severe an injury on his leg, that he died in consequence, and was buried on the banks of the Oikell, which marks the limits of Sutherland.—Robertson, vol. i. pp. 44-47.]

[c] [Aude, his mother, was in Caithness when she heard of her son's death, and she fled to the Orkneys in a ship she had caused secretly to be built in the woods.—Saga cited above.]

[d] [A daughter by this marriage, Grelanga, married Thorfin, the skull-cleaver, and son of Einar, Jarl of the Orkneys, and grandson of Rognwald, the companion-in-arms of Harfager.—Robertson, vol. i. p. 82.]

other brother, Björn, who met her with his retinue, and invited her with her whole troop. This invitation she accepted joyfully; afterwards she took lands in possession herself of an immense extent, and set up her abode at Hvamm, near the Breidfjord, where Olaf Feilan, the only son of Thorstein, succeeded her at her death, on the very day he was married. She was a Christian, but did not build any church, erecting only some crosses,[a] at which she said her prayers, and before her death she expressed a wish to be buried on the part of the beach covered by the sea at flood time, not willing, she said, to rest in unhallowed soil. She, as well as her brothers, were ancestors of powerful and illustrious descendants.[b]

In the valley of Hvin, in the south-west of Norway, lived a baron, named Grim, to whom a highborn man from Götaland, Björn, applied for reception, as he had been outlawed from his country. Grim received him in his house, but tempted by the immense mass of silver which Björn had carried with him, he planned a scheme to murder him; this, however, did not succeed, and Björn took up his abode with another baron, named Andott, who lived in the same district, and whose daughter he married, when his first wife, left by him in Götaland, was dead. Hither, also, the son of his first marriage, named Eyvind, repaired, and got all his ships of war, he himself being tired of piratical life, which he had carried on for some time during his exile. Eyvind, surnamed *Austmaðr, the Man from the East*, made sail to the Western Islands, but entered, after the lapse of some time, into a treaty with the Irish king Cerbhal of Ossory, A.D. 858-888, by which he promised to defend his lands, on condition of becoming his

[a] [The Thorfinn Karlsefne Saga says, "Aude arrived in Iceland, and abode the first winter with her brother Björn. And she had a place for prayer on the Cross Hill, whereon she caused to be upraised a cross, for she had been baptized, and was strong in the faith."]

[b] Landnáma II. 11, 15-19; Eyrbyggia, ch. 1-3; Laxd. Saga, ch. 1-7.

son-in-law. Accordingly, he married his daughter Rafarta, and had by her a son, named Helgi, who was sent to be bred up with some people in the Sudreys. Two years afterwards, however, when his father and mother went to see him, they found him so lean and starved, that they could hardly recognise him, upon which they took him to themselves. From this circumstance Helgi got the nickname of *magri, the meagre, lean.*

Meanwhile Thrond, a son of Björn, Eyvind's father, by the sister of Andott, had grown up to be a warrior like his half-brother, and of course set out on piratical expeditions as soon as possible. He fought in the great battle of Hafrsfjord A.D. 872, where king Harold crushed the power of the petty kings in south-western Norway, on the side of the latter, and was obliged, like so many others of the vanquished, to take to flight. He sailed to the Sudreys, accompanied by a renowned Viking, Anund, from Rogaland, near Stavanger, who had fought at his side, and lost a leg in the battle, but nevertheless, when his wound was healed, continuing a staunch warrior on his wooden leg, from which he got the nickname of *tréfót*, wood-foot. When he was fighting his hardest, it is related that his men used to shove a block of wood to him; resting his maimed leg upon this, he laid about him manfully.

Thrond and Anund became intimate friends, and passed some years in piratical expeditions, chiefly on the Scottish coasts. One summer they went to Ireland, and spent some months in company with the aforesaid Eyvind, who generously made over to his half-brother Thrond all his part of the inheritance which might become due to him at the decease of their father Björn. At the end of the summer Thrond and Anund returned to the Sudreys. Some years afterwards Thrond received news from Norway of his father's death, and that the inheritance had been taken possession of in his name by his uncle Andott, but that the traitor Grim, now lieutenant to the king, claimed

it in the name of the latter. Thrond, therefore, although now an outlaw in Norway, lost no time in returning thither, accompanied by his faithful friend Anund, and sailed from the Sudreys in so little time, that afterwards he got the surname of *mjoksiglandi* the fast-sailing.

They were well received by Andott, who very willingly paid over the inheritance, glad, he said, to see it in the hands of his relation, and not in those of the royal servants, but advised them earnestly to go away as soon as possible in order to avoid the persecutions of Grim. Thrond listened to the advice, and hurried away, with the intention of going to Iceland, which he also carried out, settling on the east coast. Anund, however, remained, saying that he would see his friends and relations in Rogaland. Thither accordingly he went, and passed a part of the winter there, living secretly at different places, and killing the man appointed by the king to superintend the estate which had formerly belonged to himself. Hearing, however, that Grim had killed his kind host, Andott, because he had yielded up the inheritance to his nephew Thrond, he hastened back to Agder, sought and found the young sons of Andott, who had been obliged to abscond, and assisted them not only in killing Grim by setting fire to his house, but also in extorting from the royal Earl in those parts large treasures as wérgyld[a] for their father. Afterwards Anund, in company with one of the brothers, went to Iceland, and both of them settled in the north of Iceland. The other brother, who had more difficulty in escaping from the persecution of the Earl's followers, came afterwards to Iceland, and took up his abode near his brother.[b]

Meanwhile, the son of Eyvind and his Irish princess, Helgi magri, had become a mighty chieftain, and married a daughter

[a] [See the tables of Wergilds or compensations in money for blood, instead of the exaction of blood for blood, or eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth, in Robertson's *Scotland under her Early Kings*, vol. ii. Appendix E, p. 275.]

[b] Landnáma, III. 13, 15. Grettis Saga.

of Ketil Flatnef, sister to the aforesaid Queen Aude. This circumstance appears to prove, what is also the most likely in itself, that he had passed the most of his time in the west, and was resident, either in Ireland or in the Sudreys; but that he was also no stranger to Norway, we see from the circumstance, that he had a son settled, and therefore likely born, there. Like his other relations, Helgi migrated with sons and retinue to Iceland, about A.D. 880, where he chose his lands on the north side, in the inner part of the Eyjafjord, and became one of the most powerful Lords. The particulars about his arrival and taking possession of his territories are rather curious. He was, it is told, brought up in Christianity (which is also likely from his having an Irish mother), and believed in Christ, but was neverthelesss much "mixed in his faith," using to invoke the aid of Thor, the pagan god, on expeditions at sea and wherever strength and hardihood were needed. When descrying the snow-clad peaks of Iceland far in the horizon, he applied to Thor for an oracular decision about what part of the coast he should land at, and the answer directed him to the Eyjafjord on the north side. Before detecting the opening leading to it, his son Rolf (that aforesaid son, previously settled in Norway) asked, whether it was the intention of Thor to assign the glacial ocean for their winter residence. Soon, however, they found the gap, and Helgi now occupied as his territory the whole district around the long and broad fjord, from the outermost promontories to the innermost recess, calling it Eyjafjord from its islands. He erected his own abode on a place which, being a Christian, he called Christnes, and that name continued, although his sons and descendants for three or four generations were pagans. Then he distributed lands to his followers, and afterwards to other new comers, among whom were the aforesaid sons of Andott, the brothers-in-law of his father, who no doubt resorted to him on account of this relationship.[a]

[a] Landnáma, III. 12, sq.

It is mentioned above that Ketil Flatnef had a brother called Hrapp. That he also had emigrated to the Sudreys, at least for some time, is to be concluded from the circumstance, that his son, Ørlyg, was educated as a Christian by "the holy bishop Patrick" in the Sudreys. When grown up, he resolved to go to Iceland and asked the advice and aid of the bishop. Patrick gave him timber to build a church, a *plenarium*,[a] a bell, a gold coin, and some consecrated earth to put beneath the corner pillars, as no other dedication could be effected; he directed him to consecrate it to St. Columba, and to choose his abode only there, where he saw from without three mountains separated by fjords, and a valley in each of them; he should sail to the southernmost, and build the church, where on an open space he should find three erect stones. Ørlyg sailed, but in approaching Iceland a storm drove him to the north-west; he called on the aid of his saint foster-father, promising to give his name to the place where he landed. He came safely to a fjord on the large peninsula, which stretches out to N. W., and called it Patricksfiord, which name it bears still. This place, however, did not answer to the aforesaid description; next year, therefore, he sailed southwards, and found the right spot in the territory of his cousin Helgi Bjola, the son of Ketil Flatnef mentioned above. Helgi gave him lands there, around the mountain in question, which was called Esjuberg, and here Ørlyg built his church and dwelling-house. The bell which had fallen overboard when he sailed in, was afterwards found on the shore covered with sea-weeds. His descendants became great and powerful Lords, and continued

[a] [Plenarium has various meanings, as applied to books used in the Church; but most commonly it designated a copy of the Four Gospels, which it was usual to place in the middle of the Episcopal assemblies. Books of the Gospels and books of the Epistles were in use at Church services; but the Plenarium was a complete or perfect book of the Four Gospels, containing the Life of Our Blessed Lord: and this is no doubt the sense in which it is used in the text.]

Christians although they were not baptised; they believed, it is said, in St. Columba.[a]

Among the daughters of Ketil Flatnef, one had a son, called Ketil after his grandfather; he was brought up as a Christian, and, migrating, like his relatives, from the Sudreys to Iceland, took his territory on the south-eastern side, at the foot of the immense glaciers of Skaftá and Sida. There was an old tradition, that Papes, *i. e.*, Christian ecclesiastics from Ireland, had formerly resided here. It seems to be beyond doubt, that at several places on the south-eastern side the first Norwegian settlers found traces of these ecclesiastics, such as bells, croziers, Irish books, etc.; and that after them two of these places got their names, the island of Papey and the small district called Papyli. It is greatly confirmed by the indisputable authority of Dicuil,[b] who says that some Irish clergymen told him that about A.D. 795 they had passed the time from February to August on an island which they believed to be Thule, where the sun at the summer solstice was but a short time below the horizon, and that it was only a day's sail from the frozen sea.

This description can hardly mean any country but Iceland, and coincides exactly with the unpretending and simple narrative of the Icelandic recorders. The Irish priests and monks, or the Papes, as they called them, had sufficiently learnt to know in Ireland and the Sudreys, as well as in Orkney and Shetland, where islands, called Papey, and districts called Papyli, bear sufficient witness of their existence. According to the oldest Icelandic writer, Ari Frôði,[c] the Papes even continued to reside in Iceland till the arrival of the

[a] Landnáma, I. 12. [St. Columba, surnamed Columbkille, from the great number of monastic cells which he founded. He was of noble extraction from Neil, and was born at Gartan in the County of Tyrconnel in A.D. 521. In A.D. 565 he went over into Scotland and converted great numbers of the natives from idolatry to Christianity. He died in A.D. 597 in the seventy-seventh year of his age.]

[b] Dicuilus, l. c. p. 38.

[c] Islendingabók, ch. I.

Norwegians, and left it only because they would not live together with pagans. Maybe some of these hermit settlements (for otherwise they cannot be considered) continued in remote or sheltered places down to that time, while generally, as that mentioned by Dicuil, they had been abandoned soon after they had been formed. It is very likely that Ketil really found such an establishment still existing. The tradition was, that pagans could not inhabit the district, but that Ketil, being Christian, found no difficulty, and fixed his residence on the place called *kirkjubor* (church-town). This name, however, seems to involve that he found already a church there, and maybe also the ecclesiastics, who hitherto might have found means to prevent the pagans from molesting them. According to another tradition, Ketil built a church himself. He got the nickname *fíflski* (the foolish) perhaps from the pagans, who regarded his Christian zeal as a kind of foolishness.[a]

The mother of Ketil Flatnef was sister to a great lord, named Vemund gamli (the old), who likewise lived in the province of Sogn in Norway. The son of Vemund, Vedorm, the cousin of Ketil, had a son, called Holmfast, and a nephew, called Grim, who made an expedition together to the Sudreys, probably with the intention to aid or revenge their relatives, and killed the above-mentioned Earl, Asbjörn, carrying away his wife and daughter as captives. This was, perhaps, the cause why his father Vedorm durst not stay any longer in Norway, but fled to the then almost uninhabited district of Jamtaland, east of Throndheim. The captive damsel, called Arneida, continued to live in his family as a slave. Once he was visited by a Norwegian from Verdal in Throndheim, called Ketil, who had already settled in Iceland, but now made a short trip back to his native country. He bought Arneida from Vedorm, adding a third to the price which the latter demanded, thereby showing how strong a liking he had taken to

[a] Landnáma, IV. 11.

her. Before leaving Norway with him, she was lucky enough to find a chest filled with silver coins, which had been hidden in the earth; she showed it to Ketil, who in his gratefulness offered her the choice, whether she would follow him as his wife, or be restored by him to her relations. She chose to marry him, and when he had returned to Iceland he honoured her by calling his dwelling place Arneiðarstaðir.[a]

One of the most powerful chieftains and naval warriors in Norway in the earlier times of King Harold was *Geirmund Heljarskinn*, descended from the renowned king Half in Hordaland, and enjoying himself the title of king. The Sudreys and Ireland were also the favourite haunt of his expeditions, and he was generally regarded as the principal of all the Vikings residing there. He was privy to the coalition of the petty kings which ended so unluckily for themselves in the battle of Hafrsfiord A.D. 872, but happening to be in the West when the battle was fought, he did not take part in it. The aforesaid Thrond Mjöksiglandi and his friend Anund Trefót exhorted him to return to Norway with them, and try to win back his family estates, which had been sequestered by Harold; but being prudent enough to understand that he could not cope with the latter, he resisted their exhortations, and preferred settling in Iceland, whither, accordingly, he set sail, in company with his third cousin Ulf, who was married to a sister of Helgi magri, and another powerful Viking, Steinulf, whose sister afterwards married the son of Ulf. They settled in the north-west part of the island, where Geirmund occupied vast territories, and, although dropping his royal title, lived in a style more than kingly. Relatives of him and of his partners afterwards settled in his neighbourhood, and he found himself soon the head of a very powerful clan, which continued so even for some generations.[b] Another of the temporary Sudreyan settlers, Sæmund from Sogn, was in the

[a] Landnáma, IV. 2. 12. [b] Landnáma, II. 19, sq.

neighbourhood of Hafrsfjord, when the battle was fought. His ally and sworn brother Ingemund from Raumsdal, who was with him, resolved to fight on king Harold's side; Sæmund, however, declined, and thereby exasperated the king so much, that he deemed it safest to settle in Iceland, where he chose his territory on the north side. He was afterwards followed by his friend.[a]

We have already pointed above to the fact, that in the Western Islands the original population was never entirely absorbed by the Norwegian settlers as in Orkney and perhaps in Shetland. This may, we own it, for a great part be ascribed to the circumstance that the new comers from Norway found a more dense population there than in the latter, if, indeed, Shetland had any inhabitants before the Norwegians; yet still, and chiefly, it must be accounted for by the aforesaid circumstance, that they were more used as a kind of stepping-stone to other settlements, or as temporary strongholds, than as places for lasting settlements themselves, and that their Norwegian population, consequently, was generally of a more transient and fluctuating character. In saying this, however, we do not mean to deny that real and lasting Norwegian settlements were made in many parts of the Western Islands, and that the predominant influence was on the side of the Norwegians, but only to assert that the Gaelic population was by far the largest, and that the chief language spoken there was always the Gaelic, although, of course, the Norse must have come to be pretty well understood by most of the inhabitants.

The greater part of the islands have Gaelic names, but some of them, even of the larger, have Norwegian ones, and no Gaelic besides; that is to say, their original form, still shining through the alteration of later days, is Norwegian.[b] To begin

[a] Landnáma, III. 6. Vatnsdœla S.

[b] It will easily be understood that not all of the Islands are mentioned in

from the North, Lewis is only an alteration of the Norwegian *Ljóðhús* (the sounding house), wherefore also the island is called *Leodus* in our chronicle. Northuist, Harris, and Southuist, were called *Ívist*, which means simply *dwelling, habitation*, intimating, perhaps, that this was the chief abode of the Norwegians in that quarter of the group. The names *Fladda, Sanda, Watersa, Eriska*, are no doubt originally *Flatey* (flat isle), *Sandey, Vatnsey, Eiriksey; Raasa* and *Rona* were called *Rauneyjar*, the latter consequently *Rauney* (from *raun*, experiment); *Skye* was called *Skið* (piece of board), *Ulva*, near Mull, seems to have been *Ulfey* (wolf's isle), *Gometra, Gudmundarey* (Gudmund's Island), *Staffa, Stafey* (the island of staves, because of the basaltic pillars), *Jura, Diura*, perhaps *Dýrey* (island of deer).

Now it must be owned that our ancestors, like most people in former times, often changed names, belonging to other languages, into forms as similar as possible in their own language, giving a kind of plausible signification (as, indeed, when the Greeks made *Hierosolyma of Jerusalem*), and that therefore, *Ljóðhús, Ívist, Skið*, etc., may only be substitutes for Gaelic names of a similar sound, but quite different signification; yet this does not alter the fact that the islands mentioned had got Norwegian names, and therefore were probably inhabited by Norwegians; nor is it to be denied that at least the final syllable *a* or *ay*, in so many of the names, even in those, the chief part of which are of Gaelic origin, is the Norwegian *ey* (island), as, besides the aforesaid ones, which are thoroughly Norwegian, *Pabba* (*Papey*), *Oronsa*, (*Oransey*), *Colonsa*

our Sagas, and as there exists no separate list of them, the number of those names known in their Norwegian form, is rather small. Here they are: *Ljóðhús* (Lewis), *Ívist* (Uist), *Skið* (Skye), *Rauneyjar* (Rona and Raasa), *Mýl* (Mull), *Mýlarkálfr* (Calf of Mull), *Eyin helga* (the holy Island, *i.e.*, Iona), *Tyrvist* (Tyree), *Koln* (Colonsay), *Kjarbarey* (Kerrera), *Il* (Isla), *Guðey* (Gigha), *Sandey* (Sanda), *Hersey* (Arran), *Bót* (Bute), *Melasey* (Lamlash), *Kumreyjar* (Cumrays).

(*Kólnsey*), etc.; even the name *calve* (*kálfr*), calf, always affixed to the name of a larger adjacent island, of which that in question is said to be a *calf*, is found here in *Mýlarkálfr*—the Calf of Mull, near Tobermory. Also some Norwegian names of single places are yet existing, and there might on more accurate examination be found to be more than expected, as *Cornbust, Kirkbust*, in Benbecula, originally *Kornbólstaðr* or *Kornbústaðr, Kirkjubústaðr* (corn abode, church abode), of which names a great quantity exists in Norway, generally abridged in quite the same manner.

In Man, likewise, although the language is a dialect of the Gaelic, and the greater part of the population therefore always must have been of Celtic origin, many of the local names are Norwegian, as *Snæfell* (snow-mountain), the name of the highest peak, *Dalby* (*Dalabœr*), *Fleshwich* (*Fleskvík*), *Wardfell* (*Varðfell*), *Perwick* (*Petrsvík*), *Strandhall* (*Strandarhöll*), *Ronaldsway* (*Ragnvaldsvað*), *Langnes* (*Langanes*), *Laxi* (*Laxá*), *Egness* (*Eggjanes*), *Kennay* (*Kinnú*), *Sulby* (*Súlabœr*), *Mœlar, Ayre* (*Eyri*), *Jurby* (*Jórabýr, Dýrabýr?*), *Mirescog* (*Mýraskógr*), *Ramsay* (*Hrafnsá*), etc.—several places having even double names, or rather having had them in former times, as when, from the record of boundaries, written in the same codex with the Chronicle, we learn that *Kirk-Michael* was also called *villa Thorkel* i.e. *Þorkelsbœr*.[a] The best evidence, however, of the Norwegian population having been tolerably strong at Man, are the numerous runic inscriptions in the Norse language still preserved, but even these show by their numerous grammatical errors, that the language spoken here had lost much of its purity, no doubt owing to the strong mixture of the

[a] In this record, although the names seem to be very badly written, we find more Norwegian forms, as *Trollotophtan* (*Trollatáptir*), *Oxwath* (*Uxavað*), *Aryeus-ryn* (*Árósrein*), *Staynarhaa* (*Steinarhaugr*), *Mourou* (*Maurú*), *Roefial* (*Hrossfjall*), *Cornama* (*Kornhamarr*), *Totmanby* (*Þófta . . . . . .*), *Oxreiscberad* (*Uxreisaherað*), *Corna* (*Kornú*), *Heringstad* (*Hæringstaðir*), *Gryseth* (*Grjótseiti*), *Duppolla* (*Djúppollr*).

Norwegians with Celtic elements; and, indeed, of the names occurring in the inscriptions themselves perhaps the one half are Gaelic.[a]

These circumstances here explained account amply for

[a] Although I have already given an account and explanation of these inscriptions in the *Mémoires* of the Royal Society for the ancient literature of the North, yet, having since that time, through the kind communications of Messrs. G. Cumming of Lichfield, and J. Worsaae of Copenhagen, been furnished with more accurate and correct copies of some of them, as well as with copies of others not known, or at least not transcribed when I wrote that paper, I do not think it superfluous, or at least not uninteresting to the Reader to subjoin here a short list of them, referring to the lithographic table here inserted.

The inscriptions may be divided in two classes, according to the form of the letters, as shown in the table; the two belonging to Class A being quite distinct from those belonging to Class B, engraved evidently by another man, and perhaps even at a different period.

Class A. 1. Cross at Kirk Michael: MAL LUMCUN RAISTI CRVS ÞANA EFTER MAL MVRV FVSTRA SINA TOTER TVFCALS OS AÞISL ATI.

In the normal orthography: Mal Lumkun reisti kross þenna eftir Malmuru fóstra sína dóttir Dufgals es (er) Aðisl átti. Here, however, are several glaring grammatical errors; if *sína*, as it must be, is added as adjective to *fóstra*, which is masculine, and means foster-father, educator, it ought to be *sinn* not *sína*, which is the feminine form; and again, if the feminine is right, and *fóstra* means foster-mother, it ought to be "*fóstru*."

Further, if "*dóttir*" is apposition to *sína*, as it seems to be, it ought to be the accusative, *dóttur*, not the nominative, *dóttir*. Else, if the nominative be right, it must be the apposition to the subject, Mal Lumkun, and this be the name of a female, which, however, does not seem probable. Supposing, then, what seems the most probable, that Malmuru is the name of a female person, the foster-mother of Mallumkun, the whole ought to sound thus in the normal orthography: "Mal Lumkun reisti kross þenna eftir Malmuru fóstru sína, dóttur Dufgals, er Aðisl átti." In Latin, *Mallumkun erexit crucem hanc post Malmuram educatricem suam, filiam Dugaldi, quam Adislus habuit* (i.e., *in matrimonio*).

"Os," we suppose, is badly written, instead of "es," and the last letter of the name AÞISL, which is now only a single vertical line, to have lost the small addition which makes it an L. Aðisl or Aðils is a well-known northern name.

A. 2. Fragment of Cross at Kirk Onchan. . . . ITRA ES LAIFA

Runic Inscriptions in the Isle of Man.

Class A. (ᚴ = *s*, ᚼ = *o*, ᚬ = *a*, ᚾ = *n*, ᛏ = *t*, *no* ᚬ.)

1. ᛘᚬᚾ: ᚾᚢᛘᛚᚱᚢᚾᚼ: ᚱᚬᚾᛁᛋᛏᛁ: ᚴᚱᚢᚾᚴ: ᚦᚬᚾᚬᚼ: ᛁᚠᛏᛁᚱ: ᛘᚬᚾ: ᛘᚢᚾᛏᚱᚬ: ᚠᚢᚾᛏᚱᚬᚾᚼ: ᚴᚢᚾᚼᛏᚱᚬᚾᚼ: ᛏᚼᛏᛁᚱ: ᛏᚢᚾᚠᛚᚬᚾᚼ ᚴ ᚦᚬᚾᚬ: ᚦᚴ: ᚬᚦᛁᚾᚼ: ᛁᛏᛁ:

2. ..... ᛁᛏᚱᚬ: ᛁᚴ: ᚾᚬᛁᚠᚬ: ᚠᚢᚾᛋᛏᚱᚬ·ᚴᚢᚦᚬᚾᚼ: ᛋᚢᚦᚬ: ᛁᚾᚬᚾ:

Class B. (ᛁ = *s*, ᚼ = *o* or *a*, ᚬ = *a*, ᚾ = *n*, ᛏ = *t*, ᚬ = *b*.)

3. ᚦᚦᚱᛘᛁᚺᚱ: ᚦᛁᛖᛁᚢᛘᚴ: ᛁᚢᚾᚱ: ᚱᚬᛁᛁᚬ: ᚴᚱᚢᚾᛁ: ᚦᚦᚾᚬ: ᚬᛁᚠᛘᛁᚱ: ᚢᚬ: ᛁᚢᚦ: ᛁᛁᚦ ×

4. ×ᚢᚬᚱ: ᚱᛁᛁᚬᛁ: ᚴᚱᚢᚾᛁ: ᚦᚦᚾᚦ: ᚬᚠᛏ: ᚠᚱᚦᚴᚬ: ᚠᚬᚦᚴᚬᚾᚱ: ᛋᛁᚦ: ᛁᚦ: ᚦᚢᚱᚴᚬᛁᚬᚢᚱᚾ: ⁝⁝:

5. ᛉᚬᛁᚠ:ᚬᚱᛁᚠᚬᛁ: ᛁᚢᚾᚱ: ᚬᚦᚠᚱᚬᚾ: ᛁᛉᛁᚦ: ᚱᚬᛁᛁᚬᛁ: ᚴᚱᚢᚾᛁ: ᚦᚬᚾᚬ: ᚠᚢᚱ: ᛁᚬᚾᚢ: ᛁᛁᚦᚬ: ᛁᛁᚦ: ᚬᚱᚢᚴᚢᚢᚦ: ᚴᚬᚢᚬ: ᚴᛁᚱᚦᛁ: ᚦᚬᚾᚦᚦ: ᚬᚢᚴ: ᚬᚴᚬ: ᛁᛉᚬᚢᚦ ×

6. ..... ᚦᚬᛘ: ᚬᚠ: ᚢᚠᚬᛁᚠ: ᚴᚬᚢᚦᚢᚱ: ᛁᚢᚦ: ᛁᚦ: ᚴᚬᚢᚬᚱ: ᚴᛁᚱᚦᛁ: ᛁᚢᚦᚱ: ᚬᚺᚱᛘᚱ: ᚴᚢᚬ: ᚴᚢᚢ:

7. ...ᚴᚱᚢᚾ: ᚦᚬᚦ: ᚬᚠᛘᛁᚱ: ... *8.* ···· ᚴᚱᛁᛉᚾ: ᛁᚦ: ᛁᚢᛁᚱᛏᚬ ×

9. ..ᛁᚢᛁᚠ: ᚱᚬᛁᛁᚬᛁ: ᚴᚱᚢᚾᛁ: ᚦᚬᚦ: ᚬᚠᛘᛁ: ᚱᚢᛉᚢᚢᚦ: ..... ᚦᛘ ×

10. ×ᚢᚢᚬᚾᚠᛘᛁᚱ: ᛁᚢᚦᚱ: ᚦᚢᚱᚢᚢᚠᛉᚾ: ᚢᛁᚦᚲ: ᚱᚬᚢᚢᚦᚬ: ᚱᛁᛁᚬᛁ: ᚴᚱᚢᚾᚬ: ᚦᚦᚦ ᚦ: ᚬᚠᛘᛁ: ᚠᚱᛁᚦᚢᚢ: ᛉᚢᚢᚦᚢᚱ: ᛁᚢᚦᚱ ×

11. ᛁᚢᚱᚱᛁᛏᚠᚢᚱᚬ ᚦᚢᚱᚴᚬᚢᚢᚦᛁᚠᚱᚢᚱᚴᛁᚢ

12. ····R: ᚦᛁᚴᛁᛁᚬᚢ: ᚢᛁᚠᛘᛁ: ᛁ: ᚬᚱᛁᚴᚢᚢ: ᚬᛁᚦ: ᛁᚦᚬᚱᚬ: ᛁᛁᚦ ×

13. × ᛁᚦᚦᚬ: ᚢᚢᚠᚠ: ᚾᛁᚦ: ᛁᚢᚬᚱᚬᛁ: ᚱᚬᛁᛁᚬᛁ: ᚴᚱᚢᚾᛁ: ᚦᚦᚦᚬ: ᚬᚠᛘᛁᚱ: ᚬᚱᛁᚦ: ᚬᚺᚬᚢᚱᚴ: ᚴᚢᛁᚦᚢ: ᛁᛁᚦᚬ ×

14. ···· ᛁᚦᚦᛁᚱᚢᚢᛁᚱ: ᚱᚬᛁᛁᚬᛁ: ᚱᚢᚢᚦᚬᚱ: ᚦᚬᚦᚱ: ᚬᚠᛘᛁᚱ·····

15. ····· ᚱᚢ: ᛁᚢᚦ: ᛁᚦ: ᚦᚦᚦᚦ: ᚱᚬᛁᛁᚬᛁ: ᚠᛘᛁᚱᚦᚢᚱ: ᛁᛁᚠ·····

16. × ᚦᚢᚱᚠᛘᚬᚱ: ᚦᛁᚬᚠᛁ: ᚱᛁᛁᚬᛁ: ᚴᚱᚢᚾᛁ: ᚦᚦᚦᚦ: ᛁᚠᛘᛁ: ᚠᛘᛁᚠ: ᛁᚢᚦ: ᛁᚦ: ᚬᚱᚢᚦᚢᚱ: ᛁᚢᚦ: ᛁᛁᚬᚱᛁ ×

17. a. ᚴᚱᚢᚾᛁ... *b.* ...: ᛁᚢᛁᚴᚱᛁᛁᚬ·...: *c.* ·ᚦᚢᚱᛁᚦ ×ᚱᚬᛁᛁᚬᛁ: ᚱᚢᚢᚬᚱ ··

d. .... ᛁᚢᚦᚱ × ᚱᚬᛁᛁᚬᛁ × ᛁᚠᛘᛁᚱ × ᛁᚢᚦ × ᛁᛁᚬᛁ × ᛉᚢᚢᚱᚴᛁᚬᚬᚢᚢ ×

e. ᚢᚠᛁᚴᚬᛁᚬ × ᚬᛁᚢᛁᚱ × ᚬᚦᛁᚴᚱᛁᚬ × ᚬᛉ··ᚦᚦ··

---

the less tenacity of the Norwegian language, manners, and institutions in the Isle of Man and the western Islands, than in those north of Scotland, which were entirely Nor-

FVSTRA CVÞAN SVN ILAN. The last four words are evidently, transposed into normal orthography: "*fóstra góðan, sun illan,*" i.e., "*educatorem bonum, filium malum;*" curious words, showing that these inscriptions were not only panegyrics. Whether, however, both epithets refer to one person or to two, is impossible to say, as we have not the whole. *Leifa*, accus. form of "*Leifi,*" seems to be the name of the person or one of the persons in question. Of "itra es" nothing satisfactory can be made out.

Class B. 3. Cross at Ballaugh: ÞORLIBR ÞIVTVLB SVNR RAIST CRVS ÞaNA AIFTIR VB SVN SIN. In normal orthography: "Þorleifr Þjóðúlfs (Þjóstúlfs) sunr reisti kross þenna eftir Ubba (Úlf?) sun sinn." Even here we light upon many inaccuracies or errors. In ÞIVTVLB the final S, indicating the genitive, is wanting, because the following word begins with an S, and the name itself ought to be spelled either ÞIVÞVLB, if it means Þjóðúlfs, or ÞIVSTVLB, if it means Þjóstúlfs, the latter case being, perhaps, the right one, as in No. 15 we find likewise T written instead of ST (RAITI instead of RAISTI). In RAIST the final I is wanting, *raist* or *reist* being the preterite tense of rísta (to engrave), not of *reisa* (to raise). If VB means *Ubba*, accus. of *Ubbi*, it ought to have been written VBA, if *Úlf*, accus. of *Úlfr*, likewise a common name, the L is wanting, if, indeed, the writer may not be supposed to have pronounced the word like the inhabitants of the Setersdal in Norway, who say *Úv* for *Úlf*, *Káv* for *Kálf*, etc.

In Latin: *Thorleifus Thjodulfi* (*Thiostulfi*) *filius erexit crucem hanc post Ubbonem* (*Ulfum*) *filium suum.*

4. Cross at Kirk Braddan. VTR RISTI CRVS ÞaNa AFT FRaCA FAÞVR SIN ÞVRBIAVRN . . . In normal orthography: "Óttarr reisti kross þenna eft Frakka föður sinn, en Þorbjörn . . . .;" VTR ought to have been written VTAR, if, indeed, the name has not been GAVTR, as in the following, with the two first letters destroyed; RISTI is wrong, instead of RAISTI. In Latin: *Ottarus* (*Gautus*) *erexit crucem hanc post Franconum patrem suum, sed Thorbjornus. . . .*

5. Cross at Kirk Michael: MAIL BRICTI SVNR AÞACANS SMIÞ RAI STI CRVS ÞANA FVR SALV SINA SIN BRVCVIN CAVT CIRÞI ÞANa AVC ALA IMAVN. In normal orthog.: "Mœlbrigði sunr Aðakans smiðar reisti kross þenna fyrir sálu sinni (syndugri), Gautr gerði þenna ok alla í Mön." MAILBRICTI ought to have been spelled MAILBRICÞI; SMIÞ is a fault, instead of genitive SMIÞAR; SINA, accusative, is wrong, instead of SINI, dative; of SIN BRVCVIN we cannot make out anything if it be not a complete miswriting of SINTVCRI or SVNTVCRI (syndugri); CAVT ought

wegianised, and it is rather to be wondered at, that the connection with and dependence on Norway could be kept up so long, as till A.D. 1266, and in ecclesiastical respects for more

to be CAVTR, with the nominative R finale. In Latin: *Maelbrigidus filius Athacani fabri erexit crucem hanc pro anima sua (peccatrice); Gautus fecit hanc (sc. crucem) et omnes in Mannia.*

6. Cross at Kirk Michael: . . . . . ÞANA᷑AF VFAIC FAVÞVR SIN IN CAVTR CIRÞI SVNR BIARNAR CVBCVLI. In normal orthog.: ". . . . . Þenna eft Úfeig föður sinn, en Gautr gerði, sunr Bjarnar . . . . ." In AF the final T is wanting. CVB CVLI I cannot explain; may be it is mispelled, or a Gaelic name. In Latin: . . . *hanc (sc. crucem) post Ufeigum patrem suum, sed Gautus fecit, filius Björnonis* . . . Úfeigr is a very common Norwegian name.

7 and 8. Cross at Kirk Michael: . . . CRVS ÞAN AFTIR CRIMS INS SVARTA; in normal orthog.: " . . . Kross þenna eftir . . . . Grímsins svarta . . ."; in ÞAN the final A is omitted because the next word begins with an A. In Latin: *Crucem hanc post . . . . . Grimi nigri.*

9. Cross at Kirk Michael: . . . . . SVAC RAISTI CRVS ÞAN EFT RVMVN . . . . . NT; in normal orthog.: ". . . Svangr reisti kross þenna eft Hrómund . . . . . da" (góðan bónda?). SVAC wants the final R, because the next word begins with an R; perhaps the first letters of this name are destroyed, though *Svangr* may very well be used as a name without any addition. ÞAN here likewise instead of ÞANA. In Latin: . . . *Svangus erexit crucem hanc post Romundum* . . .

10. Cross at Kirk Michael: IVALFIR SVNR ÞVRVLFS EINS RAVÞA RISTI CRVS ÞANA AFT FRIÞV MVÞVR SINa. In normal orthog.: "Jóálfr sunr Þorólfs ins rauða reisti kross þenna eft Friðu móður sína." IVALFIR instead of IVALFR, INS instead of INS, RISTI instead of RAISTI. In Latin: *Joalfus filius Thorulfi rufi erexit crucem hanc post Fridam matrem suam.* At the foot of this cross, the inscription No. 11 is faintly scratched, too faintly to be possibly made anything out of.

12. Cross at Kirk Braddan: . . . . . R aSCITIL VILTI I TRICV AIÞSOARA SIIN. In normal orthog.: ". . . . (e)r Ásketill vélti í tryggvu, eiðsvara sinn;" aSCITIL, instead of ASCATIL, AIÞSOARA instead of AIÞSVARA . . In Latin—*quem Ascatillus decepit in treuga, consacramentalem suum.*

13. Cross at Kirk Andreas: SaNTVLF EIN SVARTI RAISTI CRVS þaNA AFTIR ARIN BIAVRC CVINV SINA. In normal orthog.: "Sandúlfr, (Söndulfr) inn svarti reisti kross þenna eftir Arinbjörg konu sína." VLF instead of VLFR, EIN instead of IN. In Latin: *Sandulfus niger erexit crucem hanc post Arinbjargam uxorem suam.*

14. Cross at Tynwald Hill: . . . INaIRVIR RAIST RVNAR ÞAER AFTIR. . . . In normal orthog.: ". . . inervir (?) reist rúnar þær eftir . . ." In

than a century longer. It was owing, as it appears to us, partly to the naval strength of Norway in the Middle Ages; partly, and perhaps chiefly, to the spirit of independence,

Latin . . . (ineirvir'?) sculpsit literas hasce post . . . . The name INaIRVIR, evidently not complete, is perhaps a Gaelic one; to the Norse language it hardly belongs.

15. Cross at the Vicarage of Jurby: . . . . . RV SVN IN aNAN RAITI FAIRÞVR IAL . . . . . In normal orthog.: ". . . ru sun, en annan reisti Færþórr (?) Jal . . . . . ." RAITI is misspelled for RAISTI; FAIRÞVR is rather curious; I have ventured to suggest the form Færþórr, which may be called grammatically possible, but never occurs anywhere in books or monuments. Perhaps the name is a Gaelic one, as Ferteth, Ferchad, only altered or misspelled. In Latin: . . . . *ræ filium, sed aliam (crucem) erexit Fairthurus Jal* . . .

16. Cross at Kirk Braddan: ÞVRLABR NEACI RISTI CRVS ÞaNA AFT FIAC SVN IN BRVÞVR SVN IABRS. In normal orthog.: "Þorleifr (Þorláfr) Neaki reisti kross þenna eft Fjak (Fjang?) sun (sinn) en bróðursun Jabrs" (Ívars?). The names NEACI and FIAC seem to be Gaelic; RISTI is misspelled for RAISTI; after SVN the pron. poss. SIN seems to be wanting. IABRS is either Gaelic, or misspelled for IBARS, IVARS. In Latin: *Thorlavus Neaki erexit crucem hanc post Fiac filium (suum) sed fratris filium Jabri.*

17. Cross at Kirk Onchan: *a*) on the top: . . CRVS . ., *i.e.* kross—*crucem.* *b*) lower down. . : . . ISVCRIST, *i.e.*, Jesu Krist. *c*) below on the right arm; ÞVRIÞ RAIST RVNAR; Púríðr reist rúnar, *i.e.*, *Thurida sculpsit literas.* On the other side, *d*) below on the right arm: . . . SVNR RAISTI AFTIR SVN SINA MVRCIBLV; here it seems likely that the B in MVRCIBLU is turned by a mistake to the wrong side, and ought to have been an a; MVRCIaLV would be Myrgjalu, Myrgjölu, accusative of a not uncommon feminine Gaelic name, written in ancient records sometimes *Muriella.* SINA (lat. *suam*) however, and the feminine name Muriella cannot agree with SVN; I might therefore be inclined to think that SVN is totally misspelled by a careless or ignorant engraver, and ought to be CVNV; the whole would then run thus: . . . . . sunr reisti (kross) eftir konu sína Myrgjölu— . . . *filius erexit (crucem) post uxorem suam Muriellam.* *e*) Below, on the left arm: VCICAT ASVIR AÞICRIT AM . . . . NÞ — This seems to us wholly unintelligible, and is, perhaps, Gaelic. [Compare the reading and translation of these Runes with those given of them by the Rev. T. G. Cumming, in vol. xv. of the Manx Society, pp. 19-38; and by Mr. Kneale in his *Guide to the Isle of Man*, p. 76, and *seq.* For a more elaborate study of Runic lore, see *The old Northern Runic Monuments of Scandinavia and England.* By George Stephens, F.S.A., published at Copenhagen 1869, in two vols. folio.]

prevailing among the Insular chieftains themselves, which made them prefer an allegiance which, owing to the distance, could scarcely be more than nominal, to the Norwegian kings, rather than to the dominion of the Scottish king, who being always at hand, could exercise it with greater force. It is very likely that in this respect the expedition of King Hácon, had it even been crowned with complete success, would have soon had quite different effects from what might be expected, as the chieftains, seeing that now also the Norwegian king had the mind and power to make their dependency a real, not a nominal one, they would lose their interest in keeping it up against their national sympathies, and therefore sooner or later would have thrown it off.[a]

Much has been said against king Magnus because he concluded the treaty of Perth, and ceded the Islands to Scotland. To us, however, it appears, on the contrary, a sign of great political prudence in the young king, to perceive, as he evidently did, the impossibility of maintaining a dominion of this precarious character, and to prefer ceding it on honourable conditions while his power was still strong enough to obtain such, rather than to struggle on at the risk of losing it unconditionally. It must nevertheless be owned that the connection, however loose it may have been, and the anomaly

[a] [There is no doubt that Man and the Isles played fast and loose between Norway and Scotland, yielding homage to the power whose influence they were most likely to feel at the moment, then making light of their oaths of fealty when the pressure was removed. This was more especially the case with the island chieftains who held possessions on the mainland on the north-west of Scotland. England occasionally shared the allegiance of Man with Norway, for its knights shifted their allegiance according to what they presumed to be for their interest. Thus, in 1212, we find Reginald, King of Man, liegeman to King John of England (see Appendix, No. 7); and again, in 1219, liegeman to King Henry III. (Appendix, No. 10); and in the same year Reginald makes over to Pope Honorius III. the Isle of Man, which he declares to be his by hereditary right, and free from all service. (Appendix, Nos. 8 and 13.)]

of it ever so evident to all and everybody, yet the comparatively short period during which the connection existed, cannot but be to us Norwegians one of peculiar interest and gratification to dwell on, as bearing ample evidence of the conspicuous position among the European powers enjoyed by Norway in its days of past glory.

And very remarkable is the fact, that although so early severed from Norway, and with a population more Gaelic than Norwegian, the Isle of Man has preserved until our days the outward form, at least, of the legislature peculiar to Norway in former times, and organised by the Norwegians wherever they formed settlements. Even the name of the place where the annual meeting is held, the *Tynwald*, is the old Norwegian denomination of *Þingvöllr* (field of the Thing or Parliament), only slightly modified. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at, that a Norwegian historiographer should look upon the ancient records contained in this small volume as of the greatest interest, and by re-publishing it in a handy form try to make it more accessible, than it has hitherto been, as well as by accompanying it with notes make it more intelligible and useful to his countrymen.

Of our Chronicle only one manuscript codex now exists, nor is it likely that there have at any time been other copies, at least none complete. The codex, given, as we are informed by a notice written inside by *Roger Dodsworth, Eboracensis, antiquitatum apprime studiosus*, to the library of Sir Robert Cotton A.D. 1620, has since that time belonged to this collection, even after the transferring of the whole library to the British Museum. The codex is signed *Julius*, A. VII., and in Wanley's Catalogue of the Cottonian Library it is *Codex membranaceus in quarto, constans e foliis* 132. The size, however, might rather be called duodecimo than quarto. Nor is the volume entirely filled up with the Chronicle, on the contrary, this forms only a small part of the whole, for the

contents of which (being 18 distinct pieces, most of them having originally nothing to do with each other, and only accidently bound together,) we refer our readers to the Catalogue itself. Among these pieces our Chronicle is number 3 ;[a] and the following, number 4, *Limites seu divisiones terrarum monachorum de Russyn insulæ Manniæ a terris regis*, belongs to the same original volume, having been the last part of it, before it was bound together with the other things.

The[b] handwriting in the main part of the Chronicle bears the character common to the latter half of the thirteenth century, and as it finishes with the year 1257, where it is relieved by another, we may safely conclude that the volume has been commenced some time previous to that period, and that the words with which the legend, related p. 102 and 104, concludes—*Hæc sicut ab ore ejus didicimus, scripsimus*, are the words of the author himself, not copied by him from another record, and consequently, that the author heard the tale from the very man, who was so wonderfully rescued from the persecution of Harold the son of Godred, about A.D. 1249 or 1250. With the entry for A.D. 1275, a third, more recent, handwriting, with cursive characters like those usual about A.D. 1300, begins; and finally, a fourth, with the entry for A.D. 1313. This shows that the Chronicle has been successively continued from A.D. 1257 by contemporary writers, yet, as will easily be perceived, very languidly, without any pretensions to completeness, only some stray events being entered. The list of the bishops of Man, which follows the Chronicle as a kind of Appendix, is begun by the same hand as that which has written the main part of the former, and carried down to about

[a] [It is entered as follows :—3. Chronica regum Manniæ et insularum et episcoporum et quorundam regum Angliæ, Scotiæ, et Norwegiæ, a rege Cnuto A°. 1000 usque ad A^m 1316 sparsim.]

[b] [See a facsimile of the MS., given by Dr. Oliver in the preface to vol. i. of his *Monuments of the Isle of Man*, Vol. IV. of the Series.]

the same period, finishing with bishop Simon, who died A.D. 1247, but mentioning the sexennial vacancy of the see, which shows that the writer has laid down his pen during the episcopate of Richard (from A.D. 1253), yet before his death (1274), as the entry about this bishop is written by another hand. This entry, as that about his successor Marcus, are in one handwriting, consequently posterior to the death of Marcus, about 1300, but anterior to the death of his successor Alan, A.D. 1320, where a new hand commences, which lasts till A.D. 1348, when again another handwriting, of a more recent character, begins, and lasts to the end, A.D. 1376. The last words have been obliterated. As to the author or compiler himself, it may be safely stated that he was a monk of Russin Abbey. Not only chronicles like these are generally the works of monks, or rather the annals of one or another monastery, successively continued by their inmates; but several entries in our Chronicle are obviously such as to evince a peculiar interest in all and everything concerning the aforesaid abbey. Thus, A.D. 1112, the foundation of the abbey of Savigny, the mother of Furness, is recorded; A.D. 1126, the foundation of Furness Abbey, the mother of Russin; A.D. 1134, the foundation of Russin itself; A.D. 1176, the foundation of the short-lived monastery of *Mýraskógr* and its translation to Russin; A.D. 1189, the death of Rodulf, abbot of Furness; A.D. 1192, the migration of the abbey to, and re-migration from, Douglas; A.D. 1229, 1237, 1240, 1249 and 1265, the burial of illustrious persons at Russin; A.D. 1257, the dedication of the church at Russin; A.D. 1316 the spoliation of Russin Abbey; and, above all, the statement about the miraculous event already mentioned, that the man who had fled from the persecutions of Harold A.D. 1249 or 1250, came to Russin, and that the writer had taken the narrative down from his own mouth. Moreover, the records about the boundaries of the land belonging to the monastery show that the book was in its possession at least at the time when this Appendix was written.

As to the manner in which it was originally got up, it is easy to see, from a comparison with the Melrose[a] Chronicle, that this has furnished, what we might style the framework to it, being the source, from which, although not immediately, the principal author compiled the statements of general interest, among which he inserted those stray original records which he had in store about the events in the Isle of Man, the only way in which he was able to give to his work the character of annals, which had otherwise been impossible. The objection might be made, that, as many of the first entries are evidently in the words of Simeon of Durham, the author may have had immediate recourse to a copy of this author; it is, however, to be observed, that also in the Melrose Chronicle Simeon is verbally transcribed in many places, as far as his annals go; that no passage in our Chronicle originally due to Simeon is wanting in the Melrose annals, which shows that at least the author did not need any copy of Simeon to get any of his entries, and finally, that the borrowings from the Melrose Chronicle continue even after the period when the annals of Simeon cease. The most characteristic of these we have pointed out in the notes, and among them we will here only mention some containing the most convincing proofs of our statements, viz.—the entries about the foundation of Melrose Abbey and those connected with it, that of Rievaux, its mother, and that of Holm Cultran, its daughter (pp. 60 and 62). Again, however, that the Melrose Chronicle cannot have been the immediate source of the present work, is evident from the great number of chronological errors occurring in the latter, and being as many divergencies from the most accurate statements in the former. Even the very entry about the foundation of Melrose Abbey is wrongly referred to A.D. 1139, instead of 1136. We are therefore entitled to conclude that our writer, in laying

[a] [See the arguments against this opinion, and in favour of this Chronicle being derived from a Chronicle of Furness now lost, stated by Oliver, *loc. cit.*]

the plan or framework of his chronicle, has used a transcript only, derived through many intermediate copies from the original book of annals at Melrose. That this book was indeed sometimes lent out to other monasteries, no doubt for the purpose of being copied, or rather used as means to form the base upon which the peculiar annals of these monasteries were again to be constructed, appears from the two memoranda inserted in it, and reproduced in the preface to the Bannatyne edition (p. vi), stating that the abbot of Dundrenan borrowed it twice. The new manuscript drawn up at Dundrenan, or any other abbey, might likewise be lent out in its turn to other monasteries, and in this way a series of transcripts, or transcripts of transcripts might be traced, gradually deviating from the mother Codex, until at last errors like those occurring in our Chronicle were engendered. As, in our Chronicle, the foundation of the abbey of Caldra is mentioned, although not spoken of in the Melrose Chronicle, it is not improbable that the copy drawn up in that abbey has been the nearer original of the former. On the other hand, when comparing our Chronicle with that of Lanercost, written at a much later period, we find so many instances of identity (all of them pointed out in our notes) that there can be no doubt about a connection between both, while, again, the frequent divergencies and glaring errors of the latter puts it entirely out of question that the Lanercost compiler can possibly have had immediate recourse to the *Chronicon regum Manniæ*. Indeed, if the annals of all those abbeys which existed on the Scoto-English borders, or in the western part of the Metropolitan Province of York, were still preserved, it might be found on closer examination that they were all of them more or less immediately derived from the Chronicle of Melrose.

An abridged edition of our Chronicle had been already published by Camden, in his *Britannia* (London, 1587, 8vo), and only in this abridged form was it known by the public

for a very long time. That Camden omitted the first part previous to A.D. 1047 (or rather 1066), which contains only repetitions from Simeon of Durham, was no great harm, but it is difficult to guess what might have induced him to omit other passages of great importance, as that concerning the contested election of Bishop Lawrence in 1248. The publication by Camden was afterwards reproduced in several other works,—namely, as an addition to the description of Man, in the *Geographia Blaauviana*, and perhaps other works of a similar kind, lastly by the learned Langebek in his *Scriptores rerum Danicarum medii ævi*, vol. iii., accompanied by a vast number of excellent notes. Still, however, a complete edition was wanting, until one appeared in the *Antiquitates Celto-Normannicæ*, published at Copenhagen A.D. 1786, by the Rev. James Johnstone. This edition, however, is far from being good or accurate, even in the most moderate meaning of the word. It is evident that the person who copied the manuscript for the press was not at all fit for the task, the errors committed by him being so numerous and even ridiculous.[a] All these errors I corrected, carefully comparing the edition with the original MS., during a short stay in London in the month of January 1850 ; as, however, I did not think then of giving a new edition myself, and as my time was limited, I did not care for the less substantial things, as, *e. g.*, the orthographical peculiarities of the MS., especially as these were not at all different from the general character of manuscripts of that

[a] As instances, we may quote—A.D. 1015 (*i.e.* 1032), the abbreviated *presbiteris* read as *probrosis* (ejectis probrosis secularibus!); A.D. 1098 (p. 6, l. 3, from beneath), *verum etiam* read as *verumque;* A.D. 1143 (p. 9, l. 7, from above), *ipso* read as *in proximo;* A.D. 1144 (1154 ; p. 10, l. 3, from above), *ad dominum suum* read as *ad donum;* A.D. 1158 (p. 11, l. 13, from beneath), *misericordiam* read as *veniam*, besides many omissions and misreadings of names. Even the name of the English king, John (*Johannes*), is substituted by *Riccardus*, A.D. 1210 (p. 15, last line), a curious blunder for an Englishman to make!

period. Nor did I minutely note down all bibliographical particulars, completely convinced by what I saw at the first glance, that the bulk of the MS. belonged to the beginning of the last half of the 13th century, or the time about 1260.

Afterwards, however, seeing that no new edition was likely to appear for some time to come, and convinced that I could furnish one from my corrected copy of Johnstone which might satisfy all claims of accuracy and usefulness for all merely historical, not exactly bibliographical, purposes, I resolved to avail myself to this end of the opportunity afforded by the liberal and most praiseworthy habit adopted by our University, to publish editions of ancient national authors, or other valuable literary works among the *Scripta Academica*. I deemed it necessary, however, to accompany the text with historical notes, thereby trying to correct its errors and supply its deficiencies as far as regards the period of time which it comprizes. As for the subsequent times, and even for contemporary matters not closely connected with the history of Man and the Isles proper, I have relinquished the task to more competent authors. Nor do I, on the whole, pretend to any completeness, except in the explanations furnished from our own Sagas or national records; what I may have supplied from Scotch, English, or Irish authors, are merely stray bits, occasionally gathered during the preparation of my chief work on the Norwegian history, and may no doubt receive large additions, if not even corrections, by British historians. As two of these, I venture especially to name Mr. Cumming, whose description of Man I deplore having been unable to get, and Mr. J. F. Skene, whose excellent work, *The Highlanders in Scotland*, has afforded to me much information, without which I should often have been at a loss how to get on, and to which I refer those of my readers who might like to penetrate farther into the history of the Somerledian descendants, for information.

I rejoice, however, in being able, by the kindness of the learned and distinguished Keeper of the Vatican Archives at Rome, the Rev. Father Theiner, to supply from this peerless collection several interesting and important records concerning Man and the Isles, hitherto entirely unknown, and here for the first time published. These, as well as others, extracted from *Rymeri Foedera*, and from Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*, I give as *pièces justificatives* in an Appendix, the order being of course strictly chronological. In these documents I have preserved the exact orthography such as it exists in the respective copies from which they are transcribed.[a] In the Chronicle itself, however, from the reason stated above, the usual orthography of Latin books is adopted, only the nouns proper are scrupulously copied from the codex, letter by letter; the evident errors being marked by (?), or sometimes corrected, but the erroneous reading in this case always noticed in the notes. I regret only, that when comparing the edition of Johnstone with the original manuscript, I had not the time likewise to compare the records about the boundaries of the Russin lands, which Johnstone has published along with the Chronicle, and which might have furnished an interesting addition to the Appendix.[b] They are, however, of more interest to the topographer and the linguist than to the historian, and the want of them may therefore be less felt in an edition like this. Here I perform only the task of the historian, not of the antiquarian bibliographer.

Before taking leave of the reader, it is necessary to say

[a] [After the example of W. F. Skene, in his recent edition of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, and by the advice of Professor Stubbs, the orthography in this edition is adjusted to the standard usually adopted in Latin books, for the convenience of the reader, as the documents are published only in elucidation of the text, and not as original records.]

[b] [They are published by Dr. Oliver in the *Monumenta de Insula Manniæ*, vol. i. p. 206, Volume IV. of the Manx Society Series. Also in English, from Johnstone's translation, in Vol. XV. of the Manx Society, p. 53.]

some words about the different ways of spelling and pronouncing the names, especially of places, occurring in the Chronicle, or elsewhere in our notes, or in narratives and records concerning Man and the Isles. They may be divided into two chief classes, those of Gaelic and those of not Gaelic origin, the most numerous among the latter being of course the Norwegian ones. As to the first class, the modern conventional way of spelling them, I suppose after the modern pronunciation, is very different from their spelling in Gaelic, and what must even have been their pronunciation in the mediæval times, to judge from the way in which they are spelled in the Sagas, and which comes much nearer to the written Gaelic forms; *Duncan*, written in Gaelic *Donnchadh*, is written in the Sagas *Dungaðr* (*r* being only the masculine suffix); *Dugald*, in Gaelic *Dubhgall*, is written in the the Sagas *Dufgall*; *Donald*, in Gaelic *Domhnall*, in the Sagas *Dofnaldr*; *Rory*, in Gaelic *Ruaidhri*, in the Sagas *Ruðri*; *Kenneth*, in Gaelic *Cionadh*, in the Sagas *Kynaðr*, etc. In our Chronicle, as in most of the Latin records from those times, a middle course is followed between the original Gaelic spelling and the Anglo-Scottish pronunciation; as *Duncanus* (modern), *Dufgaldus* (more like the Gaelic), *Dompnaldus*; *Muircertach* (in the Sagas *Myriartak*, *Muriartak*, or *Myrkjartan*), in modern spelling *Murcard*, is written partly *Murecardus*, *Murcardus*, partly *Murkartac*; *Angus* is written *Engus*, as in the Sagas. As to the Norwegian names of men, *Haraldus*, *Olavus*, *Haco* are the forms commonly used in Latin records for *Haraldr*, *Olafr*, *Hákon*; *Godredus* and *Reginaldus*, sometimes *Raignaldus* and *Reginandus*, are the English forms for *Guðröðr and Rögnvaldr* or *Ragnvaldr*; *Sytric*, as in the Irish coins, for *Sigtryggr*. Of Gaelic names of places only very few are found in the Chronicle, and generally more like the forms given to them in the Sagas, than the modern ones, as *Galwedia*, Galloway, Norw. *Gaddgeðlar*; *Etholica*, Atholl, N. *Atjöklar*;

Both, Bute, N. *Bót; Yle*, Isla, N. *Íl.* As to the Norwegian names of places, they are generally not much altered, as *Lodhus, Lodws, Leodus*, Lewis, N. *Ljóðhús; Ramsa, Ramso*, Ramsay in Man, N. *Hrafnsá; Santwat*, N. *Sandvað*, Sandyford; *Mirescog* or *Mirescohc*, N. *Myriskógr; Ragnaldswath, Rognalwat, Ranaldwath*, N. *Rögnvaldsvað*, Reginald's ford; *Warchfell* (more correct *Warthfell*), N. *Varðfell* (the mountain of the beacon).

The Isle of *Man* is called, as commonly in Latin records, *Mannia;* the Norwegian form *Mön* (which is also expressed in the Runic *Maun*), has only suffered the modification of the vowel indispensable in the nominative singular of feminine words, the original vowel of which is *a*, which always returns in the genitive, as *önd* (soul), gen. *andar;* so also *Mön*, gen. *Manar.* The other Islands, comprised under one denomination, are called in the Chronicle *Soderenses* or *Sodorenses.* This is a Latinisation of the Norwegian name *Suðreyjar*, composed of *suðr* (*i.e.* south) and *eyjar* (*i.e.* islands), and meaning, therefore, properly *Southern Islands*, in opposition to the Northern Islands of Orkney, Shetland, and Færey. In Latin, therefore, *Insulæ Australes* had been a more adequate and reasonable translation, *Soderenses* being almost nonsense, and having no doubt originated from people who did not understand the meaning of *suðr* (south), but believed it to be the name of a place, from which they could form a local adjective in the common way by adding the termination *-ensis.*

To such a belief, at least afterwards, the word *Sodorensis* has given birth in England, as the Bishop of Man is always styled *Bishop of Sodor and Man*, the first name being no doubt thought by most people to design a place, while few, or none, dream of its meaning only *South*, and that the bishop is consequently styled *Bishop of the South and Man.* As the Islands, the *Insulæ Sodorenses*, from which the name is derived, do not now any more belong to the diocese of Man, the

bishop ought indeed entirely to drop this ridiculous addition, or at least change it into a more reasonable form.[a] To us the form *Sudreys* (from *Suðreyjar*), in analogy with *Orkneys* from *Orkneyjar*, seems to be most eligible and suitable to the English tongue; we have therefore ventured to adopt it in our notes, avoiding carefully the very common, but erroneous name of *Hebrides*, in which the syllable *bri* is only a misreading of *bu* in the name *Hebudæ*, *Hœbudæ*, *Æbudæ*, used by the ancient Latin writers.

I owe an explanation to my readers why I have chosen to use the English language, which may seem strange in a work published in Norway, by a Norwegian, and among the *Scripta Academica* of the Norwegian university. As, however, the liberal statutes of the latter allow the use of any European language generally known, and the subject of the work is the history of provinces now and for many centuries forming a part of the British empire, I thought that the contents might not be without interest to English readers, and being sure that all those of my countrymen who take an interest in these matters are sufficiently familiar with the English language, while, *vice versa*, our language is very little understood in England, I preferred to use the medium convenient to the greater number of readers. Moreover, the Norwegian history, although affording so much light on that of England, Scotland,

[a] [In the confirmation of churches and lands by Thomas, Earl of Derby, to Huan, Bishop of Sodor, 28th March 1505, as given in Vol. XVIII. Manx Society, p. 70, from Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*, is the following :— "Videlicet ecclesiam cathedralem sancti Germani in Holme Sodor vel Pele vocatam, ecclesiamque sancti Patricii ibidem et locum præfatum in quo præfatæ ecclesiæ sitæ sunt." May not the Isle on which the cathedral stands have been formerly known as Sodor? There has been much controversy on this point, and Professor Munch's remark on the bishop retaining the title of Sodor appears to be rather strong. See Cumming's note on this in Sacheverell's *Survey*, Vol. I. Manx Society, p. 175. In royal grants it was called Sodor and Man, and what the sovereign grants the subject may surely use.]

and Ireland, in the Middle Ages, is so little known in those countries, and the ideas especially about the relation of the Sudreys, Orkneys, and Shetland, to the mother country of Norway so extremely confused,[a] even among English and Scotch scholars, that I thought it might be worth while to use these means, if possible, of correcting some of their views, and perhaps, awakening their interest for further and deeper researches in the same rich and noble field. I am not quite without fear, nay, I am perfectly certain, that although a friend, whose modesty I will not hurt by naming him here, has shown me the kindness of going through my pages and modifying Norwegianisms, my English will yet be found rather foreign by the greater part of my British readers; this consideration, however, ought not, as I thought, to deter me from an attempt which, if successful in other respects, might produce some good results to the study of British as well as of Northern history.

I fear, likewise, that the long distance of my present residence from my own country, which makes it quite out of the question that I should be able to correct the proofs myself, and give the finishing touch to each sheet, may be found to have occasioned some inconveniences, and given rise to some faults or asperities which might otherwise have been avoided. If, nevertheless, they might prove to be less numerous than expected, this is entirely due to the kind of care my friends at home (especially I feel it my duty here to mention the British Consul-general, J. R. Crowe, C. B.), who have taken upon themselves the tedious task not only of revising the proof-sheets, but also of filling up the blanks, which from want

[a] As an instance of these confused ideas, we need only refer to what is said in the notes about the battle of Largs, which, even by writers of the better class, is sometimes attributed to a Danish king, instead of a Norwegian one, and of which the ancient pagan cairns or cromlechs are believed to be monuments.

of the necessary books here in Rome, I have been compelled to make in a great number of quotations, writing only from memory, and especially not remembering the respective numbers of pages. To them, and to all, who have kindly contributed to make the inconvenience of my absence from the place where this book is printed, less felt, I offer my warmest thanks.

P. A. MUNCH.

ROME, *Oct.* 4, 1859.

Incipiunt chronica regum Manniæ et Insularum et episcoporum et quorundam regum Angliæ, Scotiæ, Norwegiæ.

ANNO ab incarnatione Domini M. (1017)[a] Rex Cnutus filius Suani[1][b] totius Angliæ suscepit imperium. Postea, occiso Edwino[2] clitone germano[3][c] regis Edmundi,[d] filios regis ejusdem Edmundum et Edwardum ad Regem Suauorum[4] occidendos misit. Qui nolens occidere pueros innocentes eos ad regem Hungariæ Salomonem misit,[e] Edmundus[5] autem processu temporis ibidem vitam finivit: Edwardus vero Agatham, filiam germani imperatoris Henrici, in matrimonium accepit, ex qua Margaretam, postea Scotorum reginam, et Christinam, sanctimonialem virginem, et clitonem Edgarum suscepit. Cnutus Rex duxit uxorem Emmam, ex qua suscepit Hardecnutum postea Danorum et Anglorum regem, et Gunnildam filiam quæ nupsit postea Henrico Romanorum Imperatori.

MII. (1019) Cnutus rex Anglorum et Danorum Danmarc adiens ibidem per totam hyemem mansit gloriose.

[1] O. Suicerth. [2] J. and O. *add* et. [3] J. germanis. O. Germanos. [4] O. Suanuorum. [5] O. Edmundum.

[a] [See note 1, page 123. Lingard, *Hist. Eng.* i. p. 305, says: "after the death of Edmund, A.D. 1016, Canute was elected king by the unanimous voice of the nation."]

[b] The word has been altered in the MS. from Sniorth to Suani.

[c] The MS. has erroneously Edwino et Clitone germanis. It is corrected from the *Chronicle of Melrose*.

[d] *et* is erroneously added in the MS.

[e] [Canute sent them to his half-brother Olave, King of Sweden. If we

TRANSLATION OF THE CHRONICLE.

Here begin the Chronicles of the Kings and of the Bishops of Man and of the Isles, and of some of the Kings of England, of Scotland, and of Norway.

In the year 1000 from the Incarnation of our Lord, King Canute, son of Sweyn, began to rule all England. After a while, having put to death Edwin the Etheling, brother of King Edmund, he sent Edmund and Edward, sons of the same king, to the King of the Swedes, to be put to death. The latter, unwilling to kill the innocent children, sent them to Solomon, King of Hungary, where Edmund, in course of time, ended his life; while Edward married Agatha, daughter of Henry, Emperor of Germany, by whom he had issue, Margaret, afterwards Queen of Scotland; Christina, a cloistered virgin; and Edgar the Etheling. King Canute married Emma, by whom he had issue Hardecanute, afterwards King of the Danes and of the English; and a daughter, Gunhilda, who was afterwards married to Henry, Emperor of the Romans.

In the year 1002, Canute, King of the English and of the Danes, went to Denmark, and there passed the whole winter in great splendour.

may believe those who hardly possess the means of knowing it, the messenger who conducted the children was instructed to request, in secret, of Olave, that he would order them to be murdered. From Sweden they were conveyed to the court of Stephen, King of Hungary. Solomon was not born till after the year 1051.—Ling. i. 306.]

Anno MIII. (1020). Rex Cnutus Angliam rediens magnum concilium apud Cyrecestrem in pascha tenuit.

Anno MXI. (1028). Rex Cnutus, cum L. magnis navibus Norwegiam devectus Olavum regem de illa expulit,[1] sibique eam subjugavit.[a]

Anno MXII. (1029). Cnutus rex Anglorum Danorum et Noreganorum rediit.

Anno MXIII. (1030). Sanctus Olavus rex, Haraldi regis filius, quem Cnutus expulerat, reversus est in Norwegiam, et injuste[b] peremtus a Noreganis,[2] glorioso coronatus martyrio, migravit ad Dominum.[c]

Anno MXIV. (1031).[d] Rex Cnutus magno cum honore Romam profectus est, et ingentia munera in auro et argento Sancto Petro obtulit, et ut schola Anglorum libera[e] esset a Johanne papa impetravit.

Anno MXV. (1032). Ecclesia sancti Edmundi regis et martyris dedicata est, in qua rex Cnutus communi consilio præsulum et optimatum suorum ejectis presbyteris[3] sæcularibus monachos imposuit. Eodem anno ignis inexstinguibilis multa per Angliam loca cremavit.

Anno MXVII. (1034). Malcolm Rex Scotorum obiit, cui Duncan successit in regnum.[f]

Anno MXVIII. (1035). Cnutus rex Anglorum ante suum obitum super Noreganos Suuanum[4] filium suum constituit, super Danos Hardecnutum filium et Emmæ reginæ filium regem locavit; super Anglos vero Haraldum filium suum ex Hamtunensi[g] Elfiva procreatum. Postea vero Cnutus rex

[1] O. expulsit. [2] O. Noregansis. [3] J. probrosis. [4] J. Suanum.

[a] [See Dunham's *Hist. Denmark, Sweden, and Norway*, i. p. 267; ii. p. 167.]

[b] [In an insurrection excited in order to prevent the conversion of the country. See Bollandists, July 29.]

[c] [Lingard, i. 316, assigns his death to the year A.D. 1028.]

[d] [Lingard, i. 313, assigns Canute's pilgrimage to Rome to the year 1026.

In the year 1003, King Canute, returning to England, held a great council in Cirencester at Easter.

In the year 1011, King Canute sailed to Norway with 50 large ships, drove out King Olave, and brought it under subjection to himself.

In the year 1012, Canute, King of the English, and of the Danes, and of the Norwegians, returned.

In the year 1013, St. Olave the king, son of King Harold, returned to Norway, whence he had been driven by Canute, and being unrighteously killed by the Norwegians, passed to the Lord with the glorious crown of martyrdom.

In the year 1014, King Canute proceeded to Rome in great splendour, made immense presents in gold and silver to St. Peter, and obtained from Pope John exemption for the English establishment in Rome.

In the year 1015 was celebrated the dedication of the Church of St. Edmund, king and martyr, in which, by the advice of his prelates and nobles, Canute established regulars, removing the secular priests. In the same year, fire which could not be quenched, consumed many places in England.

In the year 1017, Malcolm, King of the Scots, died, and was succeeded by Duncan.

In the year 1018, Canute, King of the English, before his death, appointed his son Sweyn over the Norwegians; over the Danes he placed, as King, Hardecanute, his son by Queen Emma; and over the English, Harold, his son by Algive of Hampton. Afterwards King Canute departed this life at

[Exemption from certain imposts. See Canute's letters from Rome in Spelman Conc. 537.]

[Malcolm II. reigned 1005-1034: he was assassinated at Glammis, in the province of Angus.—Robertson, i. 98.]

[She was daughter of the Earl of Northampton. See Lingard, A.D. 1035.]

Idus Novembris apud Sceaftesburiam[1] præsenti vita decessit. Wintoniæ in veteri monasterio satis honorifice tumulatur. Non multo post tamen regnum Angliæ inter Haraldum et Hardecnutum dividitur. Eodem anno Robertus dux Normanniæ obiit, cui successit filius ejus Willelmus Bastard puer.

Anno MXXII. (1037). Haraldus, rex Merciorum et Norhumorum (!),[2] eligitur ut per totam Angliam regnaret, spreto fratre suo Hardecnuto, quia nimium in Danmarc morabatur.

Anno MXXIII. (1040). Obiit Haraldus rex Lundonis, et in Uestmuster[3] sepelitur, cui Hardecnutus successit.

Anno MXXVII. (1046). Magnus rex Norwegiæ sancti[4] Olaui regis filius, fugato rege Danorum Suano, Danmarc sibi subjugavit.

Anno MXXVIII. (1047). Magnus Rex cum Suano prælium commisit, illum de Dannemarc expulit, et in illa regnavit, ac non multo post obiit.

Anno MXXIX. (1048). Suanus Danmarchiam iterum recepit,[5] et Haraldus Harphagre[a] regis Sywardi filius Norwegiam recepit. Ipse vero ex parte matris frater sancti Olavi erat, patruus scilicet Magni regis. Hic cum Anglorum rege per nuncios suos pacem fecit. Eodem anno terræ motus magnus[6] exstitit.

Anno MXXXV. (1054). Dux Norhymbriorum Sywardus jussu regis Eduuini Scotiam cum multo exercitu intrans prælium cum rege Scotiæ Mactheath (!)[b] commisit, illumque fugavit, et Malcolmum, ut rex jusserat, regem constituit.

Anno MXXXVI. MXXXVII. MXXXVIII. MXXXIX. MXL. MXLI. MXLII. MXLIII. MXLIV. nihil memoriæ.[7]

[1] J. Scaftesburiam. [2] J. and O. Northumrorum.
[3] J. Westmunster. O. Westmuntser. [4] J. *omits* Sancti.
[5] O. *adds* et obiit. [6] J. *omits* magnus.
[7] J. *omits* nihil memoriæ. O. *omits* nihil.

[a] [This was Harold Hardrada, not Harfager.]
[b] [Macbeth. Robertson, i. p. 128, puts his defeat and death at Lum-

Shaftesbury, on the 13th of November. He is buried with becoming distinction in the old monastery at Winchester. Not long after, however, the kingdom of England was divided between Harold and Hardecanute. During the same year, Robert, Duke of Normandy died, and was succeeded by his son, William the Bastard, yet a boy.

In the year 1022, Harold King of the Mercians and Northumbrians is elected to reign over all England, his brother Hardecanute being set aside because he remained too long in Denmark.

In the year 1023, King Harold died in London, and is buried at Westminster; Hardecanute succeeded him.

In the year 1027, Magnus, King of Norway, son of King St. Olave, having expelled Sweyn, King of the Swedes, subjugated Denmark.

In the year 1028, King Magnus gave battle to Sweyn, expelled him from Denmark, and reigned in it, and not long after died.

In the year 1029, Sweyn recovered possession of Denmark, and Harold Harfager, the son of King Siward, recovered Norway. The latter was, by his mother's side, brother of St. Olave, that is to say, uncle to King Magnus. He made peace, through his envoys, with the King of England. In the same year there was a great earthquake.

In the year 1035, Siward, Duke of the Northumbrians, by order of King Edwin entered Scotland with a large army, gave battle to Macbeth, put him to flight, and made Malcolm king, as Edwin had ordered.

1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1044, Nothing to record.

phanan, in Aberdeenshire, A.D. 1058. He contends that Macbeth survived for four years his defeat by Earl Siward, July 27th, A.D. 1054.

Anno MXLV. (1064). Norualorum rex Grifinus a suis interficitur,[1] caputque ejus cum ornatura comiti Haraldo mittitur, quod mox ille regi Edwardo detulit. Rex vero Edwardus terram ipsius duobus fratribus[a] suis concessit.

Anno MXLVI.

Anno MXLVII. (1066).[b] Obiit piæ memoriæ Edwardus rex Angliæ, de quo dicitur, quod erat honor et gloria Anglorum dum vixit, et eorundem ruina dum moritur. Cui successit in regnum Haraldus filius Goduini, contra quem Haraldus Harfager[c] rex Norwegiæ prælium commisit apud Stamfordbrige;[2] et Angli victores existentes maximam cladem Norwegientium fecerunt, et omnes in fugam compulerunt. De qua fuga quidam Godredus[d] cognomento Crouan filius Haraldi nigri de Ysland[e] fugiens venit ad Godredum filium Sytric qui tunc regnavit in Mannia, et honorifice susceptus est ab eo. Eodem anno Willelmus Bastard Angliam debellavit, Haraldum regem occidit, et pro eo regnavit, et Anglos perpetuæ servituti subdidit. Præfuit autem genti Anglorum annis .xxti, mensibus .xi, cui successit filius ejus.

Anno MLI. (1070). Malcolmus rex Scotiæ[3][f] Angliam vastavit usque Clibland[4] et Margaretam in matrimonium accepit. Eodem anno obiit Godredus filius Sytric rex Manniæ, cui successit filius ejus Fingal.

Anno autem MLVI. (1075). Godredus Crouan collegit multitudinem navium et venit ad Manniam, prælium cum populo terræ commisit, sed superatus et fugatus est. Iterum exercitum et naves coadunavit, venit ad Manniam, pugnavit cum Mannensibus, victus et fugatus est. Tertio congregavit

[1] J. and O. interfectus. [2] J. and O. Steinfordbrige. [3] J. and O. Scotorum. [4] J. and O. Cliviam.

[a] [Blethyn and Rywallon were uterine brothers of Griffith; they swore fealty, and engaged to pay the ancient tribute. The head of Griffith was presented to the conqueror August 5th. These transactions took place in 1063.—Lingard, i. p. 348.]

[b] [See note 2, p. 123.] [c] [See note 3, p. 142.] [d] [See note 4, p. 143.]

In the year 1045, Griffith, King of the North Welsh, was killed by his own followers, who sent his head and ornaments to Earl Harold, who immediately transmitted them to King Edward; but King Edward gave his territory to the two brothers of Griffith.

In the year 1046.

In the year 1047, died Edward, King of England, of pious memory, of whom it is said that he was the honour and glory of the English during his life, and their ruin at his death. He was succeeded by Harold the son of Godwin, whom Harold Harfager encountered at Stamford Bridge. The English prevailed, put all the Norwegians to flight, slaying many of them. From that defeat, a certain Godred, called Crouan, son of Harold the Black of Ysland, escaped to Godred, son of Sytric, then King of Man, by whom he was received with honour. In the same year William the Bastard conquered England, slew King Harold, and reigned in his stead, reducing the English to perpetual serfdom. He ruled over the English people twenty years and eleven months, and was succeeded by his son.

In the year 1051, Malcolm, King of Scotland, laid waste England as far as Cleveland, and married Margaret. In the same year died Godred, son of Sytric, King of Man, who was succeeded by his son Fingall.

In the year 1056, Godred Crouan collected a number of ships and came to Man; he gave battle to the natives but was defeated, and forced to fly. Again he assembled an army and a fleet, came to Man, encountered the Manxmen, was defeated and put to fight. A third time he

[See note 4, p. 143.]

[Malcolm III. (Ceanmore) harried the North Riding of Yorkshire, and the Eastern Coast of Durham and Northumberland. No mercy was shown to either age, sex, or infancy; all who escaped the massacre were driven off by the invaders, so that every hovel beyond the border was supplied with slaves of English race.—Robertson, i. 132.]

multitudinem copiosam et venit noctu ad portum, qui vocatus est Ramsa,[1] et trecentos viros occultavit in silva, quæ erat in devexo montis supercilio, qui vocatur Scacafel. Orto lucis sidere, Mannenses construxerunt aciem suam, et magno impetu facto congressi sunt cum Godredo. Cumque pugna vehemens esset, trecenti viri, surgentes de insidiarum loco a tergo, Mannenses debilitare coeperunt et in fugam compellere. Cum autem vidissent se superatos, nec aliquem diffugii sibi locum patere,—nam reuma maris Ramso amnis alveum impleverat—et hostes ex altera parte constantes se persequentes, qui tunc remanserant, clamore miserabili postulabant a Godredo vitam sibi donari. Ille autem flexus misericordia et miserans calamitatem eorum, quum[2] apud ipsos per aliquod tempus nutritus fuerat, revocavit exercitum, et prohibuit ne eos diutius persequerentur. Godredus sequenti die optionem exercitui suo dedit, vel[3] si mallent Manniam inter se dividere et in ea habitare, vel cunctam substantiam terræ accipere, et ad propria remeare. Illis autem magis placuit totam insulam vastare et de bonis illius ditari, et sic ad propria reverti. Godredus autem[4] paucis qui secum remanserant de insulanis australem partem insulæ, et reliquiis Mannensium aquilonarem tali pacto concessit, ut nemo eorum aliquando auderet jure hæreditario sibi aliquam partem terræ usurpare. Unde accidit ut usque in hodiernum diem tota insula solius regis sit, et omnes redditus ejus ad ipsum pertineant.

Igitur Godredus subjugavit sibi Dubliniam et magnam partem de Laynestir. Scotos vero ita perdomuit, ut nullus qui fabricaret navem vel scapham ausus esset plus quam tres clavos[5][a] inserere. Regnavit autem sexdecem

[1] J. Ramsö. [2] J. qui. [3] J. and O. ut si. [4] J. *adds* cum. [5] O. *adds* ferreos.

[a] [This prohibition against the building of vessels requiring more than three bolts in the construction, was directed, Robertson thinks, against the Galwegians and the inhabitants of the Western coasts, in order to prevent

collected a numerous body of followers, came by night to the port called Ramsey, and concealed 300 men in a wood, on the sloping brow of a hill called Scacafel. At daylight the men of Man drew up in order of battle, and, with a mighty rush, encountered Godred. During the heat of the contest the 300 men, rising from the ambuscade in the rear, threw the Manxmen into disorder, and compelled them to fly. When the natives saw that they were overpowered, and had no means of escape (for the tide had filled the bed of the river Sulby, and on the other side the enemy was closely pursuing them), those who remained, with piteous cries, begged of Godred to spare their lives. Godred, yielding to feelings of mercy, and moved with compassion for their misfortune, for he had been brought up amongst them for some time, recalled his army, and forbade further pursuit. Next day Godred gave his army the option of having the country divided amongst them if they preferred to remain and inhabit it, or of taking everything it contained worth having, and returning to their homes. The soldiers preferred plundering the whole island, and returning home enriched by its wealth. Godred then granted to the few islanders who had remained with him, the southern part of the island, and to the surviving Manxmen the northern portion, on condition that none of them should ever presume to claim any of the land by hereditary right. Hence it arises that up to the present day the whole island belongs to the king alone, and that all its revenues are his.

Godred then subdued Dublin, and a great part of Leinster, and held the Scots in such subjection that no one who built a vessel dared to insert more than three bolts. He reigned 16

rivalry upon the seas, as his great power was based on his fleet.—i. 168. Selden supposes this to imply no more than that he had confined the naval power of the Scots within certain limits.—Moore's *Hist. of Ireland*, ii. 3.]

annos et mortuus est in insula quæ vocatur Yle.[a] Reliquit sane tres filios, Lagmannum, Haraldum, et Olavum.[b] Lagmannus major natu, regnum arripiens, septem annos regnavit. Rebellavit autem contra eum Haraldus frater ejus multo tempore. Sed tandem captus a Lagmanno, genitalibus et oculis privatus est. Post hæc Lagmannus poenitens, quod fratris sui oculos eruisset, sponte regnum suum dimisit, et signo crucis dominicæ insignitus, iter Jerosolimitanum arripuit, quo et mortuus est.

Anno MLXXIII. (1093). Occisus est Malcolmus rex Scotiæ ab Anglis,[c] cui successit Duncanus.[d] Eodem anno obiit piæ memoriæ Margareta regina Scotiæ.

Anno MLXXV. (1095). Omnes proceres insularum audientes mortem Lagmanni, miserunt legatos ad Murecardum Obrien regem Yberniæ, postulantes ut aliquem virum industrium de regali stirpe in regem eis mitteret, donec Olavus filius Godredi cresceret. Annuit eis rex libentissime, et quendam Dompnaldum[1] filium Tadc[e] ad eos misit, monens et præcipiens ei, quatinus[2] cum omni benignitate et modestia regnum, quod sibi non debebatur, gubernaret. Sed ille postquam ad regnum pervenit, parvi pendens præcepta domini sui, cum magna tyrannide abusus est regno, et multis sceleribus perpetratis, tribus annis enormiter regnavit. Tunc omnes principes insularum una conspiratione commoti, adversus eum congregati sunt, et expulerunt a finibus suis. Ille autem fugiens ad Yberniam, non est ultra reversus ad eas.[3]

[1] J. Domnaldum.

[2] J. *omits* quatinus, *adds* ut. O. *adds* ut. [3] J. and O. eos.

[a] [In the year after he was expelled from his Irish conquests, A.D. 1095, Godred died of a pestilence in the Isle of Isla. There is a tradition that while Man belonged to the kingdom of the Isles, the rents of that island were paid in Isla, those in silver at Creig-u-airgid (the rock of the silver), and those in kind at Creig-a-mone (the rock of the rents in kind).—Pennant, vol. i. p. 261.]

[b] [See note 5, p. 148.]

[c] [Malcolm III. reigned from A.D. 1058-1093. He perished, November 13,

years, and died in the island called Islay. He left three sons, Lagman, Harold, and Olave. Lagman, the oldest, seized the reins of government, and reigned seven years. Harold, his brother, continued long in rebellion against him, till at length he was taken, mutilated, and deprived of his eyes. Afterwards, Lagman repenting that he had put out his brother's eyes, voluntarily resigned the kingdom, took the cross, and went to Jerusalem, where he died.

In the year 1073, Malcolm, King of Scotland, was slain by the English, and succeeded by Duncan. In the same year died Margaret, Queen of Scotland, of pious memory.

In the year 1075, all the chiefs of the Isles hearing of the death of Lagman, sent messengers to Murchadh[f] O'Brien, King of Ireland, begging of him to send some competent person of the royal race to be their king, till Olave, son of Godred should have grown up. The king willingly assented, and sent them one Donald, son of Teige, admonishing him to govern with all mildness and moderation, a kingdom which was not his. Donald, however, after taking possession of the kingdom, made light of the directions of his lord, and abusing his power very tyrannically, and committing many enormities, reigned as a monster for three years, after which time all the chiefs of the Isles conspired, and, rising in a body, drove him from their territory. He fled to Ireland and never returned.

on the banks of the river Alne ;—Robertson says, by treachery. His opponent was Robert de Mowbray, Earl of Northumberland, but the death blow was dealt by Morel of Bamborough, with whom he had once stood as godfather (Godsib), a tie considered sacred with the Gael, i. p. 146.]

[d] [Donald succeeded and reigned from November 1093 till May 1094; Duncan from the latter date to the close of the same year; and Donald again from the close of 1094 till after Michaelmas in 1097.—Robertson, i. 158.]

[e] [See note 6, p. 152.]

[f] [Otherwise Murrough.]

Anno MLXXVII. (1097). Quidam Ingemundus[a] missus est a rege Norwegiæ, ut regnum insularum arriperet. Cumque ad insulam Leodus pervenisset, misit nuncios ad omnes principes insularum, præcipiens quatinus[1] in unum convenirent et constituerent eum regem. Interim vero ipse cum sociis suis rapinis et comessationibus vacabat, mulierum et puellarum pudicitiam violabat, et ceteris voluptatibus et carnis illecebris operam dabat. Cumque hæc nunciata fuissent principibus insularum, jam in unum ad constituendum eum regem congregatis, nimio succensi furore properaverunt[2] ad eum, et supervenientes nocte, domum in qua erat combusserunt, et eum cum omnibus suis partim ferro, partim flammis exstinxerunt.

Anno MXCVIII. (1098). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Cystercii.[b] Antiochia a Christianis capta est et cometa apparuit. Cometa est stella, quæ non omni tempore, sed maxime autem in obitu regis aut in excidio religionis apparet. Eodem anno commissum est prælium inter Mannenses apud Santwat,[c] et aquilonares victoriam obtinuerunt. In quo bello occisi sunt Other comes, et Macmaras, principes ambarum partium.

Eodem anno Magnus[d] rex Norwegiæ filius Olavi filii Haraldi Harfagre,[e] volens explorare incorruptionem sancti Olavi regis et martyris, præcepit ut ejus mausolium (!)[3] aperiretur. Episcopo autem et Clero resistente, ipse rex audacter accessit, et vi regia aperiri sibi scrinium fecit. Cumque et oculis vidisset, et manibus attrectasset incorruptum corpus, subito timor magnus irruit in eum, et cum magna festinatione discessit. Sequenti nocte Olavus rex et martyr ei per visum

[1] J. and O. cunctis.

[2] J. *omits* properaverunt . . . nocte.

[3] J. *adds* sibi.

[a] [See note 7, p. 152.]

[b] On the margin of the MS. a house with two towers is drawn.

[c] [See note 8, p. 153.]

In the year 1077, one Ingemund was sent by the King of Norway to take possession of the kingdom of the Isles. When he arrived at the island of Lewis, he sent messengers to all the chiefs of the Isles to summon them to assemble and declare him king. In the meantime he and his followers spent the time in plundering and revelling. They violated girls and matrons, and gave themselves up to every species of pleasure and sensual gratification. When the news reached the chiefs of the Isles, who had already assembled to appoint him king, they were inflamed with great rage, hastened against him, and coming upon him in the night, set fire to the house in which he was, and destroyed, partly by the sword and partly by the flames, Ingemund and all his followers.

In the year 1098, the abbey of St Mary of Citeaux was founded. Antioch was taken by the Christians, and a comet appeared. A comet is a star which is not always to be seen, but appears most usually on occasion of the death of a king, or the downfall of religion. In the same year there was a battle between the Manxmen at Santwat, and those of the North obtained the victory. In this contest were slain the Earl Other, and Macmaras, leaders of the respective parties.

In the same year Magnus, King of Norway, son of Olave, the son of Harald Harfager, wishing to ascertain if the body of St. Olave remained free from corruption, ordered his tomb to be opened. The bishop and clergy resisted the attempt, but the king audaciously came forward, and by royal order had the shrine opened for his inspection. When he had seen with his eyes and touched with his hands the incorrupt body, a great fear suddenly took possession of him, and he departed in great haste. The following night Olave the martyr king appeared to him in a vision,

? Hardrada

[a] [See note 9, p. 153.]

[b] [Hardrade. Harold Harfagr reigned from A.D. 861-931. Harold Hardrade from A.D. 1046-1066.]

apparuit, dicens: "Elige tibi,[1] inquam unum ex duobus, vel vitam cum regno infra triginta dies amittere, vel a Norvegia decedere, et eam amplius nunquam videre." Expergefactus rex a somno, vocavit ad se principes et majores natu, et exposuit eis visionem. Illi autem[2] conterriti, hoc consilium dederunt ei, ut cum omni festinatione de Norvegia exiret. Ille sine mora coadunari fecit classem centum sexaginta navium, et ad Orcades[3] insulas transfretavit,[4] quas sibi statim subjugavit et transitum faciens per universas insulas easque sibi subjiciens pervenit usque ad Manniam. Cumque applicuisset[5] ad insulam sancti Patricii,[a] venit videre locum pugnæ, quam Mannenses paulo ante inter se commiserant, quia adhuc multa corpora occisorum inhumata erant. Videns autem insulam pulcherrimam, placuit in oculis ejus, eamque sibi in habitationem elegit,[6] munitiones in ea construxit, quæ usque[7] hodie ex ejus nomine nuncupantur. Galwedienses ita constrinxit, ut cogeret eos materias lignorum cædere et ad litus portare ad munitiones construendas. Ad Moiniam (!) insulam Walliæ[b] navigavit, et duos Hugones comites invenit in ea; unum occidit, alterum fugavit, et insulam sibi subjugavit. Wallenses vero multa munera ei præbuerunt, et valedicens eis ad Manniam remeavit. Murecardo regi Yberniæ misit calceamenta sua, præcipiens ei ut ea super humeros suos in die natalis Domini per medium domus suæ portaret in conspectu nunciorum ejus, quatinus intelligeret se subjectum esse Magno regi. Quod audientes Ybernenses, ægre ferebant, et indignati sunt nimis. Sed rex saniori consilio usus, non solum, inquit, calceamenta ejus portare, verum etiam manducare mallem, quam Magnus rex unam provinciam in Ybernia destrueret.[c] Itaque complevit præceptum et nuncios honoravit. Multa quoque munera per eos Magno regi transmisit, et foedus composuit. Nuncii vero redeuntes ad[8] dominum suum narraverunt ei de situ Yberniæ et amoenitate, de frugum

[1] J. and O. tu. [2] J. *omits* autem. [3] O. Orcadas. [4] J. transfretat. [5] O. apud. [6] J. and O. eligit. [7] J. *omits* usque, *adds* hodieque. [8] O. *adds* nunti.

and said, "Choose, I tell you, one of two things, either to lose your kingdom and life within thirty days, or to retire from Norway and never again to see it." The king, awakening from sleep, summoned his princes and elders, and related to them the vision. But they, in great alarm, advised him to quit Norway as soon as possible. He immediately collected a fleet of 160 ships, and sailed to the Orkney islands, which he subdued, and, passing through all the islands, brought them under his dominion, and arrived at Man. Putting in at the island of St. Patrick, he went to visit the site of the battle which the Manxmen had fought between themselves a short time before, for many bodies of the slain still lay there unburied. When he had observed the beauty of the island, he was much pleased; and chose it for his abode, erecting forts which to this day bear his name. He compelled the men of Galloway to cut timber and bring it to the shore for the construction of the forts. He sailed to Anglesey, an island of Wales, where he found two earls Hugh, one of whom he slew, the other he put to flight, and brought the island under subjection to himself. The Welsh brought him great presents, and taking his leave of them, he returned to Man. He sent his shoes to Murrough, king of Ireland, commanding him to carry them on his shoulders through the house on Christmas day, in the presence of the envoys, in token of his subjection to King Magnus. When the Irish heard this they were highly incensed and indignant, but their king, following the dictates of wiser counsel, said that he would not only carry the shoes, but eat them, rather than that Magnus should ruin a single province in Ireland. He therefore complied with the injunction, treated the envoys with honour, sent many presents also by them to King Magnus, and arranged a treaty. On their return the envoys reported to their master the situation and delightfulness of Ireland, the abundance of its produce,

[a] [See note 10, p. 155.] [b] [See note 11, p. 156.] [c] [See footnote a, p. 161.]

fertilitate et aeris salubritate. Magnus vero hæc audiens, nihil cogitabat quam totam Yberniam sibi subjugare. Itaque præcepit classem congregare, ipse vero cum sexdecim navibus procedens, explorare volens terram, cum incaute a navibus discessisset, subito ab Ybernensibus circumvallatus, interiit cum omnibus fere qui secum erant. Sepultus est autem juxta ecclesiam Sancti Patricii in Dun.[1] Regnavit autem in regno insularum sex annis. Quo mortuo, miserunt principes insularum propter Olavum filium Godredi Crouan, de quo superius mentionem fecimus, qui tunc temporis degebat in curia Henrici regis Angliæ, filii Willelmi, et adduxerunt eum.

Anno MCII. (1102). Olavus filius Godredi Crouan[a] coepit regnare super omnes insulas, regnavitque XL.ta annis. Erat autem vir pacificus, habuitque omnes reges Yberniæ et Scotiæ ita sibi confoederatos, ut nullus auderet perturbare regnum insularum omnibus diebus ejus. Accepit autem uxorem Affricam[b] nomine filiam Fergus[2] de Galwedia, de qua genuit Godredum. Habuit et concubinas plures,[c] de quibus filios tres, scilicet Reignaldum, Lagmannum, et Haraldum, et filias multas generavit, quarum una nupsit Sumerledo regulo[d] Herergaidel,[3] quæ fuit causa ruinæ totius regni insularum. Genuit namque ex ea filios IV., Dubgallum, Raignaldum, Engus, et Olavum, de quibus latius in sequentibus dicemus.

Anno MCXII. (1112). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Sauiniensis.[e]

Anno MCXXVI. (1126). Obiit Alexander[f] Rex Scotiæ, cui successit David frater ejus. Eodem anno fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Furnes.[g]

Anno MCXXXIII. (1133). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Riuallis.[4][h] Eodem anno eclipsis solis facta est quarto

[1] J. and O. Duno.
[2] J. Fergusii.
[3] O. Herergaildel.
[4] J. and O. Rievallensis.

[a] [See note 12, p. 166.]

[b] [Afreca was the daughter of Fergus, by his wife Elizabeth, a natural daughter of Henry I. of England.—Robertson, i. 357.]

and the salubrity of its climate. Magnus, hearing this, could think of nothing but the conquest of all Ireland. He therefore ordered a fleet to be assembled, and going on himself before, with sixteen ships, to explore the country, landed incautiously, was suddenly surrounded by the Irish, and perished with almost all who were with him. He was buried near the church of St. Patrick, in Down. He reigned over the Isles six years. After his death the chiefs of the Isles sent for and brought over Olave, son of Godred Crouan, of whom we have already spoken, who was at that time residing at the court of Henry, King of England, son of William.

In the year 1102, Olave, son of Godred Crouan, began to reign over all the Isles, and he reigned forty years. He was a man of peace, and was in such close alliance with all the kings of Ireland and Scotland, that no one ventured to disturb the kingdom of the Isles during his time. He took a wife named Affrica, daughter of Fergus of Galloway, by whom he had issue Godred. He had also many concubines, by whom he had issue three sons, Reginald, Lagman, and Harold, and many daughters, one of whom was married to Sumerled, Lord of Argyll; and this was the cause of the ruin of the whole kingdom of the Isles; for he had issue by her four sons, Dugald, Reginald, Angus, and Olave, of whom we shall speak more fully hereafter.

In the year 1112, the abbey of St. Mary of Savigny was founded.

In the year 1126, Alexander, King of Scotland, died, and was succeeded by his brother David. In the same year the abbey of St. Mary of Furness was founded.

In the year 1133, the abbey of St. Mary of Rivaulx was founded. In the same year there was an eclipse of the sun,

[c] [See note 13, p. 167.] [d] [See note 14, p. 167.] [e] [See note 15, p. 169.]

[f] [Alexander died 25th April 1124. He reigned from 1107-1124.—Robertson, i. 183. Burton, i. 423, says April 27.]

[g] [See note 16, p. 170.] [h] [See note 17, p. 170.]

nonas Augusti, feria quarta, ita ut dies in noctem verteretur aliquamdiu.

Anno MCXXXIV. (1134). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Caldra. Eodem anno[a] Olavus rex dedit Yvoni[b] abbati de Furnes partem terræ suæ in Mannia ad Abbatiam constituendam, in loco qui vocatur Russin; deditque ecclesiis insularum terras et libertates; et erat circa cultum divinum devotus et fervidus, tam deo quam hominibus acceptabilis, præter[1] quod plus isti domestico vitio regum indulgebat.[2]

Anno MCXXXVI. (1135). Obiit Henricus rex Angliæ,[c] et Stephanus comes Boloniæ nepos ejus successit in regnum, et in die coronationis suæ ad missam oblita est pax dari populo.

Anno MCXXXIX. (1139). Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Malros.[d] Eodem anno commissum est bellum de Standarath inter Anglos et Scotos, et Scoti victi fugerunt.

Anno MCXL. (1140). Obiit sanctus Malachias episcopus et legatus Yberniæ apud Claram Vallem, sepultusque est in oratorio beatæ virginis Mariæ, in quo sibi bene complacuit.[e]

Anno MCXLI. (1141). Fundata est abbatia Sancti Mariæ de Holm Coltran.[f]

Anno MCXLII. (1142). Godredus filius Olavi transfretavit[3] ad regem Norvegiæ,[g] cui nomen erat Hinge,[4] et hominium suum ei fecit, et moratus est apud eum, honorifice susceptus ab eo. Eodem anno tres filii Haraldi fratris Olavi, qui nutriti fuerant apud Dubliniam, congregantes magnam turbam hominum et

[1] J. and O. propter. [2] J. and O. indulgebant. [3] J. transfretat. [4] J. Ingo.

[a] [See note 18, p. 170.]

[b] [In the copy of the letter of Olave to Thurstan, Archbishop of York, published by Beck in his Annals of Furness, from the Harleian MS. in the British Museum, the abbot is called Eudo, not Yvon. In the list of abbots given by West, in his *History of Furness*, p. 84, Yvon or Evan is the first abbot, Eudo the second. See Appendix, No. 3. In the MS. volume which contains the Chronicle, is bound up a description of the boundaries of the lands of Rushen Abbey. This very interesting topographical document is given by Johnstone at the end of the Chronicle, and also by Dr. Oliver, vol. i. *Mon.*, p. 206.]

on Wednesday the 2d of August, so that for some time day was converted into night.

In the year 1134, the abbey of St. Mary of Calder was founded. In the same year King Olave gave to Ivo, Abbot of Furness, a piece of his land in Man, to establish a monastery at a place called Rushen, and he gave to the churches of the Isles lands and privileges. He was devout; and zealous in promoting the divine service; and acceptable to God and man, except in as much as he indulged too much in the domestic vice of kings.

In the year 1135, Henry, King of England, died, and was succeeded by his nephew, Stephen, Count of Boulogne, on the day of whose coronation, the pax[h] was not communicated at mass to the people, through forgetfulness.

In the year 1139, the abbey of St. Mary of Melrose was founded. In the same year was fought the battle of the Standard between the English and the Scots, in which the Scots were defeated, and put to flight.

In the year 1140, the Bishop St. Malachy, legate of Ireland, died at Clairvaux, and was buried in the chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which he well loved.

In the year 1141, the abbey of St. Mary of Holme, Cultram, was founded.

In the year 1142, Godred, son of Olave, crossed over the sea to the King of Norway, whose name was Hinge, and did homage to him. He was well received, and remained some time. In the same year three sons of Harold, the brother of Olave, who had been brought up in Dublin, assembling a large body

[e] [King Henry I. died December 2, 1135.—Lingard, ii. 49.]

[d] [See note 19, p. 171.] [e] [See note 20, p. 171.] [f] [See note 21, p. 171.]

[g] [See note 22, p. 171. This took place June 29, 1153.]

[h] [The salutation "Peace be with you" (called the pax) is made by the celebrant at High Mass to the deacon, by whom it is passed to the subdeacon, and so on in succession to the other ministers and attendants, and formerly, also to the people.]

omnes profugas[1] regis, venerunt ad Manniam postulantes ab eodem rege medietatem totius regni insularum sibi dari. Rex autem cum audisset, placare eos volens, respondit super hoc consilium se habiturum ; cumque diem et locum constituissent, ubi concilium haberi debuisset, interim illi nequissimi de morte regis inter se tractabant. Constituta autem die convenerunt utræque partes in portu, qui vocatur Ramsa, sederuntque seriatim rex cum suis ex una parte, illi vero[2] cum suis ex altera. Regnaldus autem medianus frater,[3] qui eum percussurus erat, stabat seorsim loquens cum quodam viro de principibus terræ. Cumque vocatus venisset ad regem, vertens se ad eum quasi salutans eum, securim fulgentem in altum levavit, et caput regis uno ictu amputavit. Perpetrato autem tanto scelere statim terram diviserunt inter se. Paucis diebus transactis, congregata classe, transfretaverunt ad Galwediam, volentes sibi subjugare. Galwedienses autem conglobati et magno impetu facto, congressi sunt cum eis. Illi statim terga vertentes, fugerunt cum magna confusione ad Manniam, omnesque Galwedienses qui in ea habitabant quosdam jugulaverunt, alios expulerunt.

Anno MCXLIII. (1153). Obiit beatæ memoriæ Bernardus primus Abbas Clarevallis.[4] Eodem anno obiit David rex Scotiæ,[a] cui successit Malcolm nepos ejus, more regio in regem sullimatus. Ipso[5] anno occisus est Olavus rex, sicut supra diximus, in die sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli. In proximo autumno venit Godredus[b] filius ejus de Norvegia cum quinque navibus, et applicuit apud Orcadas.[6] Omnes autem principes insularum, audientes eum venisse, gavisi sunt, et convenientes in unum, ipsum unanimiter elegerunt sibi regem. Godredus igitur ad Manniam veniens tres filios Haraldi

[1] J. profugos. [2] J. and O. una cum. [3] J. and O. *omit* frater, *add* fuerat.
[4] J. Clarevallensis. [5] J. and O. *omit* ipso, *add* in proximo. [6] J. Orcades.

[a] [David I. died May 24, A.D. 1153. He reigned from 1124-1153. Malcolm IV. reigned from 1153-1165, dying December 9.]

[b] In the MS. it is written Dòdredus.

of men, and among them all the refugees from the dominions of Godred, came to Man, and demanded from the king one half of the whole kingdom of the Isles for themselves. The king having heard their application, and being desirous to pacify them, answered that he would take advice on the subject. When the day and place for holding a meeting had been agreed upon, these most wicked men spent the interval in planning the death of the king. On the appointed day both parties met at the port called Ramsey, and sat down in order, the king and his followers on one side, and they with theirs on the other. Reginald, the second brother, who was to give the fatal blow, stood apart, speaking to one of the chiefs of the country. On being summoned to approach the king, turning to him as if in the act of saluting, he raised his gleaming battleaxe on high, and at a blow cut off the king's head. As soon as this atrocious act was perpetrated they divided the country between them. After the lapse of a few days they collected their fleet, and sailed to Galloway with the purpose of conquering it. But the men of Galloway, forming a compact body, rushed upon them with great impetuosity; whereupon the invaders turned and fled in great confusion to Man, and massacring some, expelled the rest of the Galloway residents in the island.

In the year 1143 died Bernard, of blessed memory, first abbot of Clairvaux. In the same year died David, King of Scotland. He was succeeded by his grandson Malcolm, who was raised to the throne according to royal usage. In the same year King Olave was slain, as we have already stated, on the feast of the holy apostles Peter and Paul. In the following autumn Godred, his son, came from Norway with five ships, and put in at the Orkneys. All the chiefs of the Isles were rejoiced when they heard of his arrival, and assembling together, unanimously elected him for their king. Godred then came to Man, seized the three sons of Harold,

comprehendit, et in ultionem patris sui digna morte multavit. Fertur etiam,[1] quod duorum oculos eruit, et unum occidit.

Anno MCXLIV. (1154). Coepit regnare Godredus[a] et .XXX tribus annis regnavit. De quo multa memoriæ digna narrari potuissent, quæ nos brevitatis causa omisimus. Tertio anno regni sui miserunt propter illum Dublinienses, ut regnaret super se. Qui, collecta navium multitudine et copioso exercitu, Dubliniam venit, et gratanter a civibus cum magno tripudio susceptus est. Paucis vero diebus interjectis, communi consilio et consensu eum in regem sullimarunt.[2] Quod cum audisset Murcardus rex Yberniæ, collecta innumerabili multitudine Hyberniensium, properavit versus Dubliniam, ut Godredum expelleret et eam sibi subjugaret. Cum venisset prope civitatem quæ vocatur Cortcelis[b] ibidem fixis tentoriis permansit. Crastino die elegit tria millia equitum,[3] quibus præfecit fratrem suum couterinum[4] nomine Osiblen, et misit eum cum prædictis equitibus ad civitatem ut colloquium cum civibus haberet, simul etiam ut virtutem eorum exploraret. Cum autem appropinquarent civitati, Godredus cum suis et omnes cives Dubliniæ grandi cum strepitu exeuntes et magno impetu facto irruerunt in eos, et tanto imbre telorum eos debilitare coeperunt, ut continuo eos terga vertere coegissent. Osiblen autem frater Regis, cum audaciter resistere conaretur, circumseptus ab hostibus cum multis aliis interiit. Ceteri beneficio cornipedum evaserunt. Cum ad dominum[5] suum revertissent, totum[6c] ordine ei retulerunt. Rex autem cum audisset fratrem suum esse occisum, inconsolabili dolore luxit eum, et præ nimia tristitia præcepit exercitibus suis ut redirent unusquisque ad loca sua. Godredus vero post paucos dies reversus est in Manniam, dimisitque

[1] J. autem, O. et. [2] J. and O. sublimarunt. [3] J. *adds* sibi.
[4] J. coutrerinum. [5] J. ad domum. [6] J. totam rem ordine.
[a] [See note 23, p. 175.]
[b] Perhaps "Corteclis." It is written in a more recent hand, the original word having been erased.

and, to avenge his father's murder, awarded them the death they deserved. Another story is that he put out the eyes of two of them, and put the third to death.

In the year 1144, Godred began his reign, and reigned thirty-nine years. Many things worthy of note might be related of him which we have omitted for the sake of brevity. In the third year of his reign the people of Dublin sent to request him to reign over them. Whereupon, assembling a great number of ships, and a large army, he went to Dublin, where he was received by the citizens with great satisfaction and demonstrations of joy. A few days later they deliberated, and unanimously appointed him king. When Murrough, King of Ireland, heard of this, he collected an immense body of Irishmen, and hastened to Dublin to drive out Godred, and bring the city under subjection to himself. Arriving near the town called Cortcellis, he halted and pitched his camp. On the following day he selected three thousand horsemen, over whom he placed his uterine brother Osiblen,[d] and sent him with the above-mentioned cavalry to the city, to enter into parley with the inhabitants, and try their courage. On the approach of this detachment to the city, Godred and his followers, with all the citizens of Dublin, issued forth with great clamour, rushed impetuously upon the enemy, and assailed them with such a shower of arrows that they were at once compelled to fly. Osiblen, the king's brother, boldly continuing the struggle, was surrounded and slain with many others. The rest owed their safety to their chargers, and, returning to their lord, related in detail what had happened. When the king heard of the death of his brother he mourned for him with inconsolable sorrow, and was so oppressed with grief that he ordered his soldiers to return to their homes. Godred after a few days went back to Man, and dismissed

[c] Here there is a small vacant space in the MS.

[d] [Probably a form of O'Sullivan.]

omnes principes insularum redire ad propria. Cumque vidisset regnum confirmatum esse sibi, nullumque ei posse resistere, coepit tyrannidem exercere contra principes suos; nam quosdam eorum exhæreditavit, alios de dignitatibus ejecit, quorum unus nomine Thorfinus filius Oter[a] ceterisque potentior, accessit ad Sumerledum,[1] et postulavit ab eo Dubgallum filium suum ut constitueret eum regem super insulas. Audiens hæc Sumerledus gavisus est valde, et tradidit ei Dubgallum filium suum, qui assumens eum circumduxit per omnes insulas, et subjugavit ei universas, accipiens obsides de singulis. Unus vero princeps Paulus[b] nomine clam fugiens venit ad Godredum, et narravit ei omnia quæ gesta fuerant. Audiens hæc Godredus consternatus est mente, et continuo præcepit suis naves præparare, et festinanter ire eis obviam. Sumerledus vero cum suis collegit classem octoginta navium, et properavit obviam Godredo.

Anno MCLVI. (1156). Commissum est navale prælium[2] inter Godredum et Sumerledum in nocte epiphaniæ Domini, et magna strages hominum ex utraque parte facta est.[c] Cum autem dies illucesceret, pacificati sunt; et diviserunt inter se regnum insularum, factumque est regnum bipartitum a die illa usque in præsens tempus; et hæc fuit causa ruinæ[3] regni insularum, ex quo filii Sumerledi occupaverunt[4] illud.

Anno MCLVIII. (1158). Venit Sumerledus in Manniam cum quinquaginta tribus navibus, et commisit prælium cum Godredo, et fugavit eum, et totam insulam vastavit, et abiit. Godredus vero transfretavit ad Norwegiam quærere[5] auxilium contra Sumerledum.

Licet hic introserere quoddam miraculum de sancto Machuto confessore Domini.

---

[1] J. Sumerlidum. [2] O. bellum. [3] J. *omits* regni.
[4] J. occuparunt. [5] J. quæsitum. O. querire quæsitum.

[a] [About ten years before Godred's connection with Dublin, Reginald M'Torquil, a grandson of Jarl Other, who fell at Sandwath, held the government or leadership of the Dublin horsemen. Godred's arrival in Dublin must

the chiefs of the Isles to their respectives abodes. When he now found himself secure on his throne, and that no one could oppose him, he began to act tyrannically towards his chiefs, depriving some of their inheritances, and others of their dignities. Of these, one named Thorfinn, son of Oter, more powerful than the rest, went to Somerled, and begged for his son Dugald, that he might make him king over the Isles. Somerled, highly gratified by the application, put Dugald under the direction of Thorfinn, who received and led him through all the islands, subjecting them all to him, and taking hostages from each. One of the chiefs, however, called Paul, secretly fled to Godred, and informed him of what had occurred. Godred was greatly alarmed by the intelligence, and ordered his followers to get ships in readiness and start immediately to encounter the enemy. On the other hand, Somerled and his party assembled a fleet of eighty ships, and hastened to meet Godred.

In the year 1156, a naval battle was fought between Godred and Somerled, during the night of the Epiphany of our Lord, with great slaughter on both sides. But when daylight came they made peace, and shared between them the kingdom of the Isles, and from that day to this the kingdom has remained divided. Thus was the kingdom of the Isles ruined from the time the sons of Somerled got possession of it.

In the year 1158, Somerled came to Man with fifty-three ships, gave battle to Godred, put him to flight, plundered the whole island, and retired. But Godred crossed over to Norway, for the purpose of asking assistance against Somerled.

We may here insert the account of a certain miracle of St. Maughold, a confessor of the Lord.

---

have interfered with his position; and, probably, in consequence of the feud thus engendered, Godred, on his return to Man, dispossessed Thorfin Otterson of his lands in the island. They may have been members of the old Hy Ivan race, which probably still lingered in the north of Man.—Robertson, i. 349.]

[Johnstone erroneously supposes this to have been Paul Boke or Balkason of the Icelandic Annals. See note 33, p. 189.] [See note 24, p. 176.]

Eodem tempore, cum adhuc Sumerledus esset in Mannia in portu quæ vocatur Ramso, nuntiatum est exercitui eius ecclesiam Sancti Machuti[a] multis pecuniis esse refertam ; hic enim locus omnibus ad se confugientibus propter reverentiam sanctissimi confessoris sui Machuti cunctis periculis tutum refugium existebat. Unus autem ex principibus ceteris potentior, Gillocolmus[1] nomine, suggessit Sumerledo de prædictis pecuniis, nihilque pertinere asserebat ad sancti Machuti pacem, si ea animalia, quæ extra ambitum coemiterii[2] pascebantur, ad victum exercitus ducerentur. At Sumerledus negare coepit, dicens se nullo modo posse permittere sancti Machuti pacem violari. E contra Gillocolmus instabat magnis precibus, postulans ut sibi cum suis daretur licentia eundi illuc, et reatum sibi imputari concessit. Quo audito Sumerledus, licet invitus, permisit ei et dixit : "Inter te et sanctum Machutum sit, ego et exercitus meus[3] innocentes erimus, nec[4] prædæ vestræ participationem curamus." Tunc Gillocolmus lætus effectus venit ad suos, convocatisque tribus filiis suis et universis suis[5] clientibus, præcepit ut ea nocte omnes essent parati, quatinus primo diluculo, facto impetu, irruerent ex improviso super ecclesiam sancti Machuti, quæ inde ad duo milliaria distabat. Rumor interim pervenit ad ecclesiam de adventu hostium ; qui omnes tanto terrore perculit, ut multi ex populo qui ibi erant fugerent de ecclesia, et in abditis rupium et specubus se occultarent. Cetera multitudo, infinitis clamoribus, tota nocte misericordiam dei per merita sancti Machuti implorabant. Sexus vero infirmior, dissolutis crinibus, ejulantes, discurrebant circa parietes ecclesiæ, magnis vocibus clamantes : "Ubi es modo Machute, ubi sunt miracula tua quæ usque nunc operabaris in loco isto ? numquid propter peccata nostra nunc discedes, et derelinques populum tuum in tali angustia ? Et, si non

[1] J. Gilcolmus. O. Gilocolmus. [2] O. cimiterii. [3] J. *omits* meus.
[4] J. and O. non. [5] O. *omits* suis.

At the same time, whilst Somerled yet lay in the port of Man called Ramsey, it was reported to the army that the church of St. Maughold was full of riches; for this place was a safe refuge against all dangers, for all who fled to it, on account of the reverence paid to its most holy confessor St. Maughold.

One of the principal chiefs called Gilcolum, drew the attention of Somerled to these treasures, and maintained that it would be no violation of the asylum of St. Maughold to drive off, for the supply of the army, the cattle that were grazing outside the precincts of the cemetery. But Somerled demurred, affirming that he could in nowise allow the asylum to be violated. Gilcolum continued to urge with great earnestness his proposal, begging that he and his followers might be allowed to go there, and offering to take the responsibility on himself. Upon this Somerled reluctantly gave his consent, saying: "Let the affair be between yourself and St. Maughold; I and my army will be guiltless, nor do we wish to have any share in your spoil." Gilcolum overjoyed returned to his followers, and calling together his three sons and all his dependents, ordered all to prepare during the night, so as to be ready to rush suddenly at break of day upon the church of St. Maughold, which was distant two miles. A rumour, in the meantime, reached the church that the enemy was coming, and so alarmed by it were all, that many fled from the church, and concealed themselves in the recesses of the rocks, and in the caverns, whilst the remaining crowd, with loud and continued cries, implored the mercy of God, through the intercession of St. Maughold. The weaker sex, with dishevelled hair and mournful accents, wandered around the walls of the church, loudly crying: "Where art thou now, oh Maughold! where are thy miracles which till now thou hast worked in this place? Willst thou now quit it on account of our sins, and abandon thy people in this their distress? If

[a] [See note 25, p. 177.]

propter nos, saltem propter honorem nominis tui hac vice nos adjuva!" His, et hujuscemodi vocibus, motus, ut credimus, sanctus Machutus, eorum miseriis misertus,[1] eos de instanti periculo liberavit, et hostem eorum atroci genere mortis damnavit. Nam prædictus Gillo-Colmus cum se sopori dedisset in tentorio suo, apparuit ei sanctus Machutus toga candida præcinctus, baculumque pastoralem manu tenens. Cumque ante lectum ejus astaret, his eum verbis aggreditur: "Quid," inquit, "mihi et tibi est Gillo-Colme?[2] Quid tibi aut tuis nocui quia nunc disponis locum meum prædari?" Ad hæc Gillo-Colmus respondit: "Quis," inquit, "es tu?" At ille ait: "Ego sum servus Christi Machutus, cujus tu ecclesiam contaminari conaris, sed non proficies." Quo dicto, baculum, quem manu tenuerat, in sublime erexit, et punctum ei per cor illius transfixit. At ille miser diro clamore emisso omnes qui circumquaque in papilionibus[3] erant somno excussit. Iterum Sanctus eum transfixit, iterum ipse clamavit. Tertio[4] Sanctus idem fecit, tertio ille clamavit. Filii[5] vero ejus et omnes sui his clamoribus turbati accurrunt ad eum, sciscitantes quidnam ei acciderat. At ille vix linguam movere valens, cum gemitu dixit: "Sanctus Machutus hic affuit, meque tribus ictibus baculo suo transfigens occidit. Sed ite citius ad ecclesiam ejus, et adducite baculum et presbyteros et clericos, ut intercedant pro me ad sanctum Machutum, si forsitan indulgeat mihi quæ adversus eum facere diposui."[6] Qui celeriter jussa complentes rogaverunt clericos ut sumpto baculo sancti Machuti secum visitarent dominum suum qui jam in extremis esse videbatur. Narraverunt autem eis omnia quæ ei contigerant. Audientes hæc presbyteri et clerici et cetera multitudo, gavisi sunt gaudio magno, miseruntque cum eis quosdam ex clericis cum baculo. Qui cum coram eo stetissent, videntes eum jam

[1] J. and O. miseratus. [2] J. Gil-Colme. O. Gilocolmus. [3] J. pavilionibus.
[4] J. *omits* Tertio . . . clamavit. [5] J. and O. Filius. [6] J. disposui.

not for our sake, at least for the honour of thy name, help us now." Moved, as we believe, by these and similar supplications, and compassionating their affliction, St. Maughold delivered them from the imminent danger, and condemned their enemy to a terrible death. For when the aforesaid Gilcolum had fallen asleep in his tent, St. Maughold appeared to him clothed in a white garment, and carrying the pastoral staff in his hand; and standing before his bed, addressed him in the following words: "What is there between thee and me, Gilcolum? In what have I injured thee or thine, that thou art now about to plunder my place?" To this appeal Gilcolum replied: "Who art thou?" The saint answered: "I am the servant of Christ, Maughold, whose church thou seekest to profane, but thou shalt not succeed." Having spoken thus, he raised on high the staff that was in his hand, and drove the point through Gilcolum's heart. The unfortunate man uttered a fearful shriek, which awoke all who were sleeping in the surrounding tents. Again the saint transfixed him, again he shrieked. A third time the saint repeated the blow; a third time the man shrieked. His sons and followers, alarmed by the screams, hastened to him, inquiring what had happened. Scarcely able to move his tongue, he answered with a groan: "St. Maughold has been here, and, thrice transfixing me with his staff, has killed me. But go quickly to his church, and bring the staff with the priests and clerks, that they may intercede for me with St. Maughold, that he may perchance forgive what I was preparing to do against him." Quickly, in execution of his orders, they begged the clerks to bring the staff of St. Maughold, and come to their lord, who appeared to be lying in the last extremity. They narrated, also, all that had happened to him. The priests, clerks, and people, hearing this account, rejoiced with a great joy, and sent back with the messengers some of the clerks, who bore the staff. When they stood in his presence and saw him

pene exanimem, nam paulo ante loquelam amiserat, unus clericorum imprecatus est dicens: "Sanctus Machaldus,"[1] inquit, "qui te coepit punire, non desistat donec te ad interitum ducat, ut ceteri videntes et audientes discant locis sanctis majorem reverentiam præbere." Quibus dictis clerici ad sua sunt reversi, post quorum discessum coepit tanta multitudo muscarum grandium et tetrarum circa faciem ejus et ora volitare, ut non poterant nec ipse nec qui ei assisterant (!) eas abigere. Sic cum magnis tormentis et cruciatibus circa sextam diei horam expiravit. Quo defuncto tantus terror invasit Sumerledum et exercitum ejus, ut statim, accedente maris reumate,[2] et navibus fluitantibus, amoverent classem de portu illo, sicque cum summa festinatione ad proprias terras sunt reversi.

Anno MCLXIV. (1164). Sumerledus[a] collegit classem centum sexaginta navium, et applicuit apud Rinfriu, volens totam Scotiam sibi subjugare. Sed ultione divina a paucis superatus, cum filio suo et innumerabili populo ibidem occisus est. Eodem anno bellum fuit apud Ramso inter Reginaldum fratrem Godredi et Mannenses; et, propter dolum cujusdam Vicecomitis, Mannenses in fugam conversi sunt et Reginaldus coepit regnare. Quarto autem die supervenit Godredus de Norwegia cum magna multitudine armatorum, et fratrem suum Reginaldum comprehendit, et oculis et genitalibus privavit. Eodem anno obiit Malcolmus Rex Scotiæ, et frater ejus Willelmus[b] ei successit in regnum.

Anno MCLXVI. (1166). Duo cometæ apparuerunt ante solis ortum mense Augusti, unus ad austrum, altera ad aquilonem.

Anno MCLXXI. (1171). Richardus comes de Penbroc transfretavit in Yberniam,[3] et Dubliniam cum magna parte Yberniæ subjugavit.

[1] O. Machutus. [2] J. and O. rheumata. [3] J. Iberniam. O. Hiberniam.
[a] [See note 26, p. 177.]

almost expiring, for he had just before lost the use of his voice, one of the clerks pronounced the following imprecation:—"May St. Maughold, who has begun thy punishment, cease not till he has brought thee to death, that others, seeing and hearing, may learn to show greater reverence to holy places." Having thus spoken, the clerks returned home; and after their departure such a number of large black flies swarmed about his face and mouth, that neither he nor his attendants could keep them away. Thus did he expire in great torture and agony about the sixth hour of the day. Upon his death, such a great fear seized upon Somerled and his army, that, as soon as the ships were floated by the rising tide, the fleet left the port, and returned home as quickly as possible.

In the year 1164, Somerled assembled a fleet of 160 ships and put in at Renfrew, with the intention of subduing the whole of Scotland. But through divine punishment he was overcome by a small number of foes, and there slain with his son and a vast number of his people.

In the same year there was a battle at Ramsey between Reginald, brother of Godred, and the Manxmen, and through the treachery of a certain Viscount the Manxmen were put to flight and Reginald began to reign. On the fourth day, however, Godred returned from Norway with a large body of troops, and seizing his brother, mutilated, and deprived him of his sight.

In the same year died Malcolm, King of Scotland, who was succeeded by his brother William.

In the year 1166, two comets appeared before sunrise in the month of August, one to the south and the other to the north.

In the year 1171, Richard, Earl of Pembroke, sailed to Ireland, and subdued Dublin, with a great part of Ireland.

[a] [William, surnamed the Lion, reigned 1165-1214, dying December 4.]

Anno MCLXXI. (1171).[a] Henricus rex Angliæ fecit[1] coronari filium suum Henricum puerum in regem apud Lundoniam .xi. kal. Junii, et in die Dominica consecrari a Rogero usurpatore Eboracensi archiepiscopo; qui in alienam provinciam jus et officium alienum contra canones per regis et propriam tyrannidem, vivente venerabili Thoma Archiepiscopo Cantuariæ et in Galliis[2] exulante, sibi usurpavit. Eodem anno, in festivitate apostolorum Petri et Pauli, subito terræ motus ingens et horrendus factus est.

[b]Anno MCLXXI. (1171). Beatæ memoriæ Thomas Cantuariæ Archiepiscopus et apostolicæ sedis legatus, Primas[3] totius Angliæ, verus Christi martyr, pro justitia in ecclesia suæ sedis detruncatus est.

Anno MCLXXVI. (1176). Johannes de Cursi sibi subjugavit Ultoniam. Eodem anno Vivianus,[c] apostolicæ sedis legatus Cardinalis, venit in Manniam, et legationis suæ officium complens Godredum regem legitime desponsari fecit cum uxore sua nomine Phingola,[d] filia Mac Loclen filii Murkartac[4] regis Yberniæ, matre scilicet Olavi qui tunc triennis erat. Desponsavit autem eos Silvanus Abbas de[5] Rieualis. Ipsa die Godredus rex dedit in oblationem venerabili Abbati Silvano partem terræ apud Mirescog,[e] ubi mox monasterium construxit; sed processu temporis terra tota cum monachis concessa est abbatiæ Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin.

Anno MCLXXXII. (1182).[f] Reginaldus filius Eacmarcat in

[1] O. *adds* subjugavit. [2] O. Gallis.

[3] O. primus. [4] J. Murkartch. [5] J. *omits* de. O. Rievale.

[a] [See note 27, p. 178.]

[b] [By some oversight this paragraph is erroneously stated in Dr. Oliver's edition of the Chronicle to be a foot-note by a later hand.]

[c] [See note 28, p. 178.]

[d] [Fingola was daughter of M'Loughlin, the son of Muircheartach, King of Ireland. She had hitherto been the *handfasted* bride, not the married wife, of Godred. Such unions were not uncommon either in Ireland or Scotland, and may account for the frequent divorces which were the scandal of the rest of Europe. The issue of the *handfasted* marriages were considered legiti-

In the year 1171, Henry, King of England, caused his son Henry, yet a boy, to be crowned king at London on the 22d of May, and on the Sunday to be anointed by Roger, the usurping Archbishop of York, who, in opposition to the canons, led by the despotism of the king, and his own contempt of law, exercised a right and office not his, to the prejudice of a province not under his jurisdiction, while the venerable Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, was still alive, and an exile in France. During the same year, on the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul, a great and fearful earthquake suddenly occurred.

In the year 1171, Thomas of holy memory, Archbishop of Canterbury, and legate of the Holy See, Primate of all England, true martyr of Christ, was assassinated in the church of his See.

In the year 1176, John de Courcy subdued Ulster. In the same year Vivian, Cardinal legate of the apostolic See, came to Man, and in the discharge of his office caused Godred to be united in lawful marriage with his wife, the daughter of MacLoughlin, son of Murrough, King of Ireland, who was mother of Olave then three years old. They were married by Silvanus, Abbot of Rivaulx.

On the same day Godred gave to the Abbot Silvanus a piece of land at Mirescoge, where he soon built a monastery; but in process of time the land and the monks were made over to the abbey of St. Mary of Rushen.

In the year 1182, Reginald, son of Eacmarchat, a man of

mate, even though the connection were dissolved, and this may account for the pretensions of claimants who were stigmatised as illegitimate by those who did not recognise the unchristian practice. Possibly Reginald, chosen by the Manxmen to succeed Godred, may have been the issue of such a marriage.—Robertson, ii. 98. Fingola is the latinised form of the Irish name Finghuala, now pronounced and written Finola. It is still used in its contracted form, Nuala, an Irish female name.]

[Now Ballamona: See Oliver's *Mon.* i. p. 161.] [See note 29, p. 179.]

Manniam veniens, quidam scilicet vir de regali genere, cum magna turba hominum, absente rege, primo congressu quosdam qui litora custodiebant fugavit, et occidit ex iis circiter .xxti homines. Postea vero eadem die congregati Mannenses in unum ei viriliter occurrerunt, ipsumque cum omnibus pene suis occiderunt.

Anno MCLXXXIII. (1183). Obiit Fogolt Vicecomes de Mannia.[1]

Anno MCLXXXV. (1185). Sol passus est eclipsim in die apostolorum Philippi et Jacobi ita ut stellæ apparerent.

Anno MCLXXXVII. (1187). Capta est Ierusalem a paganis, et Sancta Crux sublata est Damascum. Eodem anno obiit Godredus rex insularum iv. idus Novembris in insula Sancti Patricii in Mannia. Prima vero æstate translatum est corpus ejus ad insulam quæ vocatur Hy. Reliquit sane tres filios, Reginaldum, Olavum et Yvarum. Reginaldus robustus tunc juvenis fuit in insulanis partibus, Olavus vero tenellus adhuc puer morabatur in Mannia.

Godredus, dum adhuc viveret, Olavum filium suum regni hæredem constituit, quia ad ipsum jure spectabat hæreditas, nam de legitimo matrimonio natus fuit, præcepitque omni Manensi populo, ut eum post suum obitum, sicut decebat, regem constituerent,[2] atque irrefragabile conservarent ei suæ fidei juramentum. Sed mortuo Godredo Mannenses legatos suos ad insulas propter Reginaldum miserant, quia vir strenuus et fortioris ætatis fuerat, et eum sibi regem constituerunt. Timebant vero imbecillitatem[3a] Olavi, utpote decennis pueri,[b] et arbitrabantur, quod is qui se propter ætatis teneritudinem regere nesciebat, subjectum sibi populum gubernare minime potuisset. Et hæc fuit causa pro qua Mannensis populus Reginaldum sibi regem constituit.

Anno MCLXXXVIII. (1188). Reginaldus filjus Godredi coepit regnare super insulas. Eodem anno occisus est

[1] J. *omits* de Mannia. [2] J. and O. constitueret. [3] J. imbecillitate.

the royal race, came to Man with a large number of followers, during the absence of the king; and in the first combat put to flight a party of those who guarded the coast, killing about twenty of them. Later on, however, in the same day, the Manxmen, assembling in a body, manfully encountered and slew him with nearly all his followers.

In the year 1183, died Fogolt, Viscount of Man.

In the year 1185, on the day of the apostles Philip and James, the sun was eclipsed, so that the stars appeared.

In the year 1187, Jerusalem was captured by the pagans (infidels), and the holy cross was carried away to Damascus.

In the same year, on the 10th of November, Godred, King of the Isles, died in the Island of St. Patrick, in Man. In the beginning of the following summer his body was removed to the Island called Iona. He left three sons, Reginald, Olave, and Ivar. Reginald, then a full grown young man, was absent in the Isles. Olave, yet a very young boy, resided in Man.

Godred during his life had appointed Olave to succeed to the kingdom, for the inheritance belonged to him by right, because he was born of lawful wedlock; and had commanded all the people of Man to appoint Olave king after his own death, and preserve inviolate their oath of allegiance. However, after the death of Godred, the Manxmen sent their messengers to the Isles for Reginald, and made him king, because he was a man of energy and of riper age. For they dreaded the weakness of Olave, for he was but a boy ten years old, and they considered that a person, who on account of his tender age, knew not how to direct himself, would be wholly incapable of governing his subjects. This was the reason why the people of Man appointed Reginald king.

In the year 1188, Reginald, son of Godred, began to reign over the Isles. In the same year was killed Mur-

[a] [A small vacant space occurs here in the MS.]

[b] [See note 30, p. 179.]

Murcardus vir potens et strenuus in omni regno insularum.

Anno MCLXXXIX. (1189). Obiit Henricus rex Angliæ, cui successit Ricardus filius ejus. Eodem anno obiit Rodolfus,[1] Abbas de Furnes, in Mellefonte.

Anno MCXC. (1190). Philippus rex Franciæ et Ricardus rex Angliæ profecti sunt Ierusalem[2] cum magnis exercitibus.

Anno MCXCII. (1192). Commissum est bellum inter filios Sumerledi Reginaldum et Engus, in quo bello multi vulnerati corruerunt. Engus tamen victoriam obtinuit. Eodem anno Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin translata est ad Dufglas, ibique per quatuor annos habitantes iterum ad Russin reversi sunt.

Anno MCXCIII. (1193). Ricardus rex Angliæ reversus est ab Jerosolimis, et in Almannia[3] captus est; pro cujus redemptione Anglia persolvit centum millia marcharum.

Anno MCXCIII. (1193). Obiit Michael episcopus insularum apud Fontanas, cui successit Nicholaus in episcopatum.

Anno MCCIV. (1204). Hugo de Lacy venit cum exercitu Ultoniam et commisit bellum cum Johanne de Cursi, eumque comprehendit et vinculis mancipavit, et Ultoniam sibi subjugavit. Postea vero Johannem liberum ire permisit. Qui cum dimissus esset venit ad regem Reginaldum, a quo honorifice susceptus est, quia erat gener ejus. Johannes quidem de Cursi habuit filiam Godredi, nomine Affricam,[4] in matrimonium, quæ fundavit Abbatiam Sanctæ Mariæ[a] de Jugo Dei, quæ ibidem sepulta est.

Anno MCCV. (1205). Johannes de Cursi iterum resumptis viribus congregavit copiosam multitudinem, sed et Reginaldum regem Insularum cum centum ferme navibus secum duxit ad

[1] O. Rodulfus. [2] J. Hierosolymas. O. Ierosolymas.
[3] J. Alemannia. [4] J. Affrecam.

rough, a chief whose power and energy were felt throughout the whole kingdom of the Isles.

In the year 1189, died Henry King of England. He was succeeded by his son Richard. In the same year Rodolph, Abbot of Furness, died at Mellifont.

In the year 1190, Philip, King of France, and Richard, King of England, set out for Jerusalem with large armies.

In the year 1192, there was a contest between the sons of Somerled, Reginald, and Angus, in which many were wounded and fell, but Angus gained the victory. In the same year, the abbey of St. Mary of Rushen was removed to Douglas. After remaining there four years the monks returned to Rushen.

In the year 1193, Richard, King of England, returned from Jerusalem and was made prisoner in Germany; for his ransom England paid 100,000 marcs.

In the year 1193, died Michael, Bishop of the Isles, at Fountains. He was succeeded in the episcopacy by Nicholas.

In the year 1204, Hugh de Lacy entered Ulster with an army, gave battle to John de Courcy, took him prisoner, and put him in chains, and subdued Ulster. Afterwards he gave John his liberty. John, on his delivery from prison, went to King Reginald, by whom he was received with distinction, because he was his brother-in-law. John de Courcy married a daughter of Godred, called Affrica, who founded the monastery of St. Mary, of the Yoke of God, where she was interred.

In the year 1205, John de Courcy, recovering his strength, collected a large force, and was accompanied by Reginald, King of the Isles, with nearly one hundred ships, to

* [*Grey Abbey*, County Down. See Archdall's *Monasticon*, annotated.]

Ultoniam. Cumque applicuissent in portum qui vocatur Stranfeord,[1] segniter obsederunt castellum de Roth. Supervenit autem Walterus de Lacy cum exercitu magno, et eos cum magna confusione fugavit, ex quo tempore Johannes de Cursi nunquam terram suam recuperavit.

Anno MCCX. (1210). Engus filius Sumerledi cum tribus filiis suis occisus est. Eodem anno Johannes[2] rex Angliæ classem quingentarum navium ad Yberniam duxit, eamque sibi subjugavit, et mittens[3] partem exercitus sui cum comite quodam nomine Fulco[4] ad Manniam, eam in una quindena fere omnino devastaverunt, et suscipientes obsides ex ea reversi sunt in patriam suam. Reginaldus autem rex et optimates ejus non erant in Mannia.

Anno MCCXVII. (1217).[a] Obiit Nicholaus episcopus insularum, et sepultus est in Ultonia in domo de Benchor, cui successit Reginaldus in episcopatu.

Libet[5] adhuc, ad ædificationem legentium, de gestis Reginaldi et Olavi fratrum aliquid compendiosius[6] retexere.

Reginaldus dedit fratri suo Olavo insulam quandam[7] quæ vocatur Lodhus, quæ ceteris insulis latior esse dicitur, sed raris colitur incolis,[8] quod montuosa et saxosa sit, et tota fere inarabilis. Incolæ vero illius plerumque de venatione et piscatura vivunt. Ad hanc ergo insulam possidendam Olavus profectus est, et habitavit in ea, pauperem ducens vitam. Cumque vidisset eam ad sustentationem suam et sui exercitus minime sufficere, accessit fiducialiter[9] ad Reginaldum fratrem suum, qui tunc morabatur in insulis, et sic allocutus est eum: "Frater" inquit, "et domine mi rex, tu nosti quod regnum insularum ad me jure hæreditario[10] pertinuit, sed quia Dominus ad hoc gubernandum te elegerat, non invideo tibi, nec moleste fero, te esse in regali culmine sullimatum,[11] Nunc ergo te

[1] J. Strangfiord. [2] J. Ricardus rex.
[3] J. *omits* mittens, *adds* multim. [4] J. Fuco. [5] J. and O. Lubet.
[6] J. compendiose. [7] J. *omits* quandam. [8] O. inculis, *adds* eo.
[9] O. fidicialiter. [10] J. hæreditatis. [11] J. and O. sublimatum.

Ulster. Putting into the port called Strangford, they laid siege, but carelessly, to the fort of Rath. Walter de Lacy came upon them with a large army, and totally routed them; and after that time John de Courcy never recovered his possessions.

In the year 1210, Angus, son of Somerled, was killed, with his three sons. In the same year, John, King of England, with a fleet of 50 ships, went to Ireland and subdued it. He sent a part of the army, with an earl of the name of Fulke, to Man. This force in fifteen days devastated nearly the whole island, and receiving hostages returned home. King Reginald, however, and his nobles were absent from Man at the time.

In the year 1217, Nicholas, Bishop of the Isles died, and was buried in Ulster, in the monastery of Bangor, and was succeeded in the episcopacy by Reginald.

Here we think it well, for the benefit of our readers, to rehearse briefly something of the history of Reginald and Olave.

Reginald gave his brother Olave a certain island called Lewis, which is said to be more extensive than the other islands, but thinly peopled, because it is mountainous and rocky, and almost totally unfit for cultivation. The inhabitants live mostly by hunting and fishing. Olave took possession of this island and dwelt there; living, however, very scantily. Finding that the island could not support himself and his followers, he went frankly to his brother Reginald, who was then residing in the Isles, and spoke to him as follows: "You know, my brother and king, that the kingdom of the Isles was mine by hereditary right, but as the Lord chose you for its governor, I do not grudge it you, nor am I discontented because you have been raised to the supreme dignity of king. I now there-

* [If there were not two bishops of the name of Nicholas, this date is incorrect. See note 54, p. 234.]

deprecor, ut provideas mihi[1] aliquam portionem terræ in insulis, in qua honeste cum meis possim vivere; nam insula Lodhus,[2] quam mihi dedisti, me sustentare non valet." Quod cum audiisset[3] frater ejus Reginaldus, habiturum se cum suis super hoc promittebat consilium; et crastina die ei super hac petitione sua responsurum. Cum crastina dies illuxisset, et Olavus vocatus venisset ad colloquium Reginaldi,[4] iussit eum Reginaldus comprehendi et catenis vinciri, vinctumque duci ad Willelmum regem Scotiæ, ut penes ipsum in carcere servaretur; quod ita factum est, fuitque Olavus catenatus[5] in carcere regis Scotiæ fere septem annis.[6a] Septimo autem anno obiit Willelmus rex Scotiæ, cui successit Alexander[b] filius eius, qui antequam moreretur, jussit ut omnes vincti, qui apud eum carceribus tenebantur, liberarentur. Olavus igitur liberatus a vinculis et suæ redditus libertati venit ad Manniam ad Reginaldum fratrem suum, moxque cum non modico comitatu virorum nobilium ad Sanctum Jacobum[c] profectus est; rediensque de peregrinatione venit iterum ad Reginandum[7] (!) fratrem suum, et pacifice susceptus est ab eo. Ipso[8] tempore fecit Reginaldus Olavum fratrem suum desponsare uxorem filiam cujusdam nobilis de Kentyre, germanam uxoris suæ, nomine Lauon,[9] deditque ei Lodhus prædictam insulam in possessionem, profectusque est Olavus cum uxore sua, valedicens fratri suo, et habitavit in Lodhus.

Post aliquantos autem dies Reginandus (!) episcopus insularum, qui successit Nicholao Episcopo, venit ad insulanas partes ut visitaret ecclesias.[d] Cui occurrens Olavus cum gaudio, et lætus de adventu ejus, utpote filii sororis suæ, jussit magnum convivium præparari. Reginandus vero dixit ad

[1] O. *adds* fratri tuo. [2] J. Leodhus. [3] O. audisset. [4] J. *omits* Reginaldi.
[5] J. cathenatus. [6] J. annos. [7] J. and O. ad Reginaldum.
[8] J. and O. in proximo. [9] J. and O. Jauon.

[a] [See note 31, p. 184.]

[b] [Alexander II. reigned from 1114-1149, dying July 8, in the small barren island of Kerrera, which fronts the bay of Oban.—Burton, ii. 91.]

fore beg that you will allot me land somewhere in the Isles sufficient for my own decent maintenance and that of my followers, for the island of Lewis which you gave me is unequal to my support." When Reginald had heard this, he promised to take advice on the subject, and return an answer to the petition next day. When next day had dawned, and Olave had come by summons, to speak with the king, Reginald ordered him to be seized, bound, and carried in chains to William, King of Scotland, to be kept prisoner by that Sovereign. This order was executed, and Olave remained prisoner with the King of Scotland nearly seven years. In the seventh year, William, king of Scotland, died, and was succeeded by his son Alexander. Before his death, however, William gave directions for the liberation of all who were confined in his prisons. Olave then, having his chains removed, and being restored to liberty, went to Man to his brother Reginald, and shortly afterwards set out with a considerable attendance of men of rank for the shrine of St. James. Returning from the pilgrimage, he again visited his brother Reginald, by whom he was received in a friendly manner. At that time Reginald caused his brother Olave to marry Lauon[a] the daughter of a certain man of rank of Kintyre, sister to his own wife, and gave him the aforesaid island of Lewis, whither Olave, taking leave of his brother, went with his wife, and dwelt there.

After some days, Reginald bishop of the Isles, successor to bishop Nicholas, came to the Isles to visit the churches. Olave went to meet him with great alacrity, and was glad of his arrival, for the bishop was son of Olave's sister, and ordered a great banquet to be prepared. Reginald, however, said to

[a] [To the shrine of St. James at Compostella, Spain.]

[b] [From the dates it would appear probable that the letter of Honorius III. to King Reginald (Appendix, No. 12) was connected with this Episcopal visitation.]

[c] [Johnstone and Oliver read this name Jauon, and translate it Joan.]

Olavum: "non communicabo tecum, frater, donec ab illiciti matrimonii vinculo canonice catholica te solvat ecclesia;" et addidit: "an ignoras quia consobrinam mulieris, quam nunc habes uxorem, ante habuisti?" Nec abnuit Olavus, quod verum fuerat, et consobrinam ejus se multo tempore concubinam habuisse testatus est. Congregata igitur synodo, Reginaldus episcopus Olavum Godredi filium et Lauon uxorem suam canonice separavit. Post hæc Olavus Scristinam(?)[1] filiam Ferkkar[2] Comitis de Ros duxit in matrimonium.[a]

Dolens autem uxor Reginaldi regis, regina Insularum, tunc temporis super disjunctione sororis suæ et Olavi,[3] et mota felle amaritudinis, totius quoque[4] discordiæ seminatrix inter Reginaldum et Olavum, misit literas latenter sub nomine Reginaldi regis ad Godredum filium suum ad insulam Ski, ut Olavum comprehenderet et occideret. Godredus mox, auditis litteris, collegit exercitum, et revera perversam[5] matris peracturus[6] voluntatem, si posset, venit ad Lodhus. Olavus vero cum paucis viris ascendens scapham modicam, et vix fugiens a facie Godredi, venit ad socerum suum Comitem de Ros. Godredus autem, tota fere destructa insula et occisis quibusdam hominibus, redit[7] ad propria.

Eo tempore Vice-Comes de Ski vir strenuus et potens in omni regno insularum Pol filius Boke[b] fugit a facie Godredi, eo quod neci Olavi consentire noluit, et habitavit cum comite de Ros una cum Olavo. Paucis transactis diebus Olavus et prædictus Vicecomes amicitiæ foedus inierunt, mediante utriusque juramento, et venerunt pariter cum una navi ad Ski et occultaverunt se in abditis locis aliquantis diebus. Denique missis exploratoribus didicerunt, quod Godredus in quadam

[1] J. Christinam. [2] J. Ferchar. O. Ferkar.
[3] J. Olavum. [4] J. totiusque quasi. [5] J. *omits* perversam, *adds* puer suam.
[6] J. facturus. O. profacturus. [7] O. rediit.

[a] [See note 32, p. 188. Olave entered into the views of his nephew with suspicious alacrity, and quickly disentangling himself from the unholy tie,

Olave: "I will not hold communication with you, brother, till the Catholic Church has canonically released you from the bonds of an unlawful marriage." The bishop added: "Know you not that you lived long with the cousin of her whom you now have as your wife?" Olave did not deny the truth of what had been said, and acknowledged that he had long kept her cousin as a concubine. A synod therefore was assembled, and in it bishop Reginald canonically separated Olave the son of Godred and Lauon his wife. Afterwards, Olave married Christina, daughter of Ferquhard, Earl of Ross.

But the wife of King Reginald, Queen of the Isles, pained by the separation of her sister from Olave, and moved by the gall of bitterness, and sower of all the discord between Reginald and Olave, wrote secretly in the name of King Reginald, to her son Godred, who was in the isle of Sky, to seize and kill Olave. Godred, on receipt of the letter, collected a force and went to Lewis for the purpose of carrying out, if he could, his mother's truly wicked desires. Olave, however, entering a small boat, with a few men, with difficulty avoided Godred, and fled to his father-in-law, the Earl of Ross, whilst Godred laid waste nearly the whole island, killed a few of the inhabitants, and returned home.

At that time the Viscount of Sky, whose power and energy were felt throughout the whole kingdom of the Isles, Páll the son of Bálki, having refused to consent to the murder of Olave, fled from Godred, and resided as well as Olave with the Earl of Ross. After a few days Olave, and the aforesaid Viscount of Sky, entered into a covenant of friendship, confirmed on either side by oath, and went together with a single vessel to Skye, where they concealed themselves for some days in secret places; they then learned from the spies they had sent out that Godred

solicited the hand of the daughter of Ferquhard, Earl of Ross.—Robertson, ii. 100.]

[See note 33, p. 189.]

insula, quæ vocabatur insula sancti Columbæ, secure cum paucis hominibus moraretur. Et coadunantes sibi omnes amicos et notos suos, et eos qui se sponte sibi jungere voluerunt, intempestæ noctis silentio tractis quinque navibus de proximo maris litore, quod ad duorum stadiorum spatium distabat a prædicta insula, insulam circumdederunt. Godredus autem et qui cum ipso fuerant surgentes primo diluculo et videntes se undique circumceptos (!)[1] ab hostibus obstupuerunt. Sed armis induti bellicis viriter[2] resistere conati sunt, sed frustra, nam circa horam diei nonam Olavus et Pol prædictus vicecomes cum omni suo exercitu, insulam ingressi sunt; et occisis omnibus, quos extra cepta (!)[3] ecclesiæ reperererunt, Godredum comprehensum oculis et genitalibus privaverunt. Quo (!) tamen facto Olavus non concessit,[4] nec resistere potuit propter filium Boke prædictum Vicecomitem. Factum est hoc anno gratiæ MCCXXIII.

In[5] proxima æstate, acceptis obsidibus ab universis magnatibus insularum, Olavus cum classe triginta duarum navium venit ad Manniam, applicuitque apud Rognalswaht. Ipso[6] tempore Reginaldus et Olavus diviserunt inter se regnum insularum, data Mannia Reginaldo super portione[7] sua cum regali nomine. Olavus vero acceptis cibariis ab populo Manniæ, cum comitatu suo ad portionem suam insularum rediit. Sequenti anno Reginaldus, assumpto secum Alano domino Galwediæ,[a] cum Mannensibus ad insulanas partes profectus est, ut partem terræ quam dederat Olavo[8] fratri suo auferret ab eo, et eam iterum suo dominio subjugavet. Sed quia Mannensibus contra Olavum vel insulanos pugnare non libuit, eo quod diligerent eos, Reginaldus et Alanus Dominus Galwediæ nihil perficientes ad propria reversi sunt.

Post modicum temporis Reginaldus sub occasione eundi

[1] J. circum septos. [2] J. *omits* viriter. [3] J. septa.
[4] J. consensit. [5] J. and O. *omit* in. [6] J. and O. proximo.
[7] J. partione. [8] J. Olavus.

[a] [See note 34, p. 189.]

was residing in a certain island, called the island of St. Colm, without apprehension, with very few attendants, Upon this, assembling all their friends and acquaintances, and all who were willing to join them, they surrounded the island during the silence of deep night, bringing over five ships from the nearest point of the shore, which was two furlongs from the above mentioned island. Godred and his companions were thrown into consternation when, rising early in the morning, they saw themselves surrounded. Being armed, however, they undertook to resist manfully, but in vain ; for about nine o'clock in the morning Olave, and Páll the aforesaid Viscount, entered the island with all their force, and putting all to death who were found outside the precincts of the church, they seized Godred, mutilated and deprived him of his eyes. Olave, however, did not give his consent to this deed, but was unable to prevent it on account of Bálki the aforesaid Viscount. This happened in the year of grace 1223.

In the following summer Olave taking hostages from all the chiefs of the Isles, came to Man with a fleet of 32 ships, and put into the port of Ronaldsway. On that occasion Reginald and Olave divided between themselves the kingdom of the Isles ; Man, with the title of king, being allotted to Reginald in addition to his portion. Olave having received provisions from the people of Man, returned with his followers to the islands which formed his portion. The following year Reginald, taking with him Alan, Lord of Galloway, and the men of Man, set out for the Isles for the purpose of taking from his brother Olave the territory which he had given him, and bringing it again under his own dominion. But as the men of Man were unwilling to fight against Olave and the men of the Isles, for whom they had a great regard, Reginald and Alan the Lord of Galloway failed in their attempt, and returned home.

A short time after this, Reginald received from the people

ad curiam Domini Regis Angliæ accepit a populo Manniæ centum marchas et profectus est ad curiam Alani domini Galwediæ. Eodem tempore dedit filiam suam filio Alani in matrimonium. Quod audientes Mannenses indignati sunt valde, et mittentes propter Olavum constituerunt eum sibi Regem.

Anno gratiæ MCCXXVI. Recuperavit Olavus hæreditatem suam,[a] regnum videlicet Manniæ et insularum, quod Reginaldus frater ejus gubernaverat per[1] .xxxviii annos, et regnavit secure duobus annis.

Anno MCCXXVIII. Olavus cum omnibus optimatibus Manniæ et fortiori parte populi transfretavit ad insulas. Paulo post Alanus[b] dominus Galwediæ et Thomas[c] Comes Etholice,[2] (!) et Reginaldus rex venerunt ad Manniam cum magno exercitu, et totam australem partem Manniæ vastaverunt, et ecclesias spoliaverunt, et viros quotquot capere poterant[3] occiderunt, et redacta est australis pars Manniæ fere in solitudinem. Et post[4] hæc reversus est Alanus cum exercitu suo in terram suam, et reliquit balivos suos in Mannia, qui redderent ei tributa patriæ. Supervenit autem Olavus rex[d] et fugavit eos, et recepit regnum suum. Et coeperunt Mannenses, qui antea circumquaque dispersi fuerant, congregari et confidenter habitare.

Eodem anno inopinate,[5] media nocte, hyemali tempore, venit Reginaldus rex de Galwedia cum quinque navibus, et in eadem nocte combussit omnes naves Olavi fratris sui[6] et omnium optimatum Manniæ apud insulam Sancti Patricii, et circumiens terram pacemque petens a[7] fratre suo mansit apud portum qui dicitur Rognalswath fere xl diebus. Interim vero adtraxit animos omnium Insulanorum, qui erant in australi parte Manniæ, ad se, et associabat[8] eos sibi. Quidam

[1] J. *omits* per. [2] J. Etholiæ. [3] J. and O. potuerunt.
[4] J. and O. per. [5] J. inopinato. [6] J. *omits* sui.
[7] J. cum fratre. [8] J. and O. associavit.

[a] [See note 35, p. 190.]

[b] [Tytler says that Alan, one of those independent princes who often dis-

of Man 100 merks under the pretence of going to the court of the Lord King of England, but he went to the court of Alan, Lord of Galloway. At the same time he gave his daughter in marriage to the son of Alan. When the Manxmen heard of this they were greatly incensed, and sending for Olave appointed him king.

In the year of grace 1226, Olave recovered his inheritance, namely, the kingdom of Man, and of the Isles, which his brother Reginald had governed thirty-eight years; Olave's reign was undisturbed for two years.

In the year 1228, Olave, with all the chiefs of Man and the greater part of the people, sailed to the Isles. Soon after, Alan, Lord of Galloway, Thomas, Earl of Atholl, and King Reginald, came to Man with a large army, devastated all the southern portion of the island, plundered the churches, killed all the men they could lay hands upon, and reduced the south of Man almost to a wilderness. Alan then returned with his army to his own country, leaving bailiffs in Man to pay over to him the proceeds of the taxes upon the country. King Olave, however, returned and drove out the bailiffs and recovered his kingdom; whereupon the people of Man, who had dispersed in every direction, came together again, and dwelt in security.

During the same year, one midnight during winter, King Reginald came unexpectedly from Galloway with five ships, burnt during the same night all the ships of his brother Olave, and those of all the chiefs of Man, at the island of St. Patrick, and going round the country seeking to make terms with his brother, remained nearly forty days at Ronaldsway. In the interval he won over and gathered round himself all the Islanders who were in the southern part of Man. Some of

dained to acknowledge the sovereignty of Scotland, fitted out a fleet of 150 ships for the invasion of Man.—*Hist. Scot.* ii. 288.]

[c] [See addition to note 34 (footnote [a]), p. 189.]

[d] [See note 36, p. 190.]

autem eorum juraverunt ei se animas suas in mortem posituros[1] pro ipso, donec dimidium regnum insularum sortiretur. E contra Olavus rex omnes[2] aquilonares Manniæ adunavit ad se et in tantum eis loquens prævaluit, quod conglutinata est anima eorum cum ipso; factumque est in quarta decima die mensis Februarii, in festo scilicet Sancti Valentini martyris.[3] Venit Olavus rex ad locum qui dicitur Tyngvalla cum populo suo et ibi paululum exspectabat. Appropinquante autem Reginaldo fratre ejus ad locum, et populum per[4] turmas disponente, ut cum fratre dimicaret, accessit Olavus cum suis obviam eis; et subito irruens in eos fugavit eos quasi oves, et[5] venientes viri impii ad regem Reginaldum interfecerunt[a] eum in eodem loco, nesciente tamen fratre ejus; quod cum audisset graviter tulit, nunquam tamen in vita sua vindictam sumpsit de morte ejus. Et multis ibidem interfectis venientes prædones ad australem partem Manniæ vastaverunt eam, et fere absque habitatore reliquerunt. Monachi autem de Russin transtulerunt corpus Reginaldi regis ad abbatiam Sanctæ Mariæ de Furnes, ibique sepultus est in loco quem sibi vivens elegerat.

Post hæc Olavus[b] adiit curiam regis Norvegiæ, sed antequam illuc perveniret, Hácho rex Norvegiæ virum quendam nobilem de regali genere nomine Husbac filium Owmundi regem super Soderenses[6] insulas constituit, vocavitque nomen ejus Haconem. Venit autem idem Háco cum Olavo et Ghotdredo (!)[7] Don filio Reginaldi, et cum multo comitatu Norwegiensium ad Soderenses insulas. Cumque venissent ad Insulam, quæ vocatur Both, et castellum, quod in ea est, expugnare voluissent, prædictus Háco ictu lapidis percussus interiit, sepultusque est in Iona insula.

Anno domini MCCXXX. Venit Olavus cum Gotdredo Don et Norwegiensibus ad Manniam,[8] diviseruntque inter se regnum[c]

[1] J. posituras. [2] J. *omits* omnes. [3] J. *adds* prælium.
[4] J. and O. et turmas. [5] O. venientesque. [6] J. Sudorenses.
[7] J. Godredo. [8] O. Mannyam.
[a] [Robertson assigns his death to 1229.—ii. 101.] [b] [See note 37, p. 190.]

them swore that they were ready to expose their lives in his cause, till he should be put in possession of half the kingdom of the Isles. King Olave, on the other hand, gathered together all the northern Manxmen, and acquired by his words such influence over them, that their souls were but one with his. On the 14th of February, the festival of St. Valentine, martyr, King Olave came with his followers to the place called Tynwald, and waited there a short time. When Reginald approached the place, and was drawing up his forces in array to give battle to his brother, Olave with his followers advanced to meet them, rushed suddenly forward, and scattered them like sheep. Certain wicked men, coming up with King Reginald, slew him on the spot, but without the knowledge of his brother, who was much grieved when he heard of the event, though never to the end of his life did he avenge his brother's death. Many fell on this occasion, and the southern part of Man being subsequently visited and devastated by pirates, scarcely a single inhabitant was left. The monks of Rushen removed the body of King Reginald to the Abbey of St. Mary of Furness, where he was buried in the place he had selected during his life.

Afterwards Olave went to the court of the King of Norway; but before his arrival Háco the King of Norway had appointed a certain nobleman of the royal race, by name Husbac, son of Owmund, king over the Sodor Islands, and gave him the name of Haco. Háco went with Olave and Godred Don, son of Reginald, and a large retinue of Norwegians to the Sodor islands. Arriving at the island named Bute, and seeking to take the castle which is on it, Háco was struck by a stone and killed, and buried in the island of Iona.

In the year 1230, Olave, with Godred Don and the Norwegians, went to Man, and divided between themselves (that

* The following words, down to "obitum," are not in the text, but at the foot of the MS.

Manniæ et Insularum, scilicet Olavus et Gotdredus. Olavus Manniam obtinuit; Godredus vero ad insulanas partes profectus in insula quæ vocatur Lodws[1] occisus est. Quo mortuo [a] Olavus regnum Manniæ et Insularum usque ad obitum.[2] . . . .

Anno MCCXXXVII., xii. kal. Junii obiit Olavus[b] Godredi filius rex Manniæ et Insularum[3] apud Insulam Sancti Patricii, sepultusque[4] est in Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin. Undecim annis regnavit Olavus in Mannia, duobus annis regnavit vivente Reginaldo fratre suo, et ix annis post mortem ejus regnum obtinuit. Quo mortuo, coepit Haraldus filius ejus regnare pro eo. Quatuordecim annorum erat Haraldus cum regnare coepisset, et xii annis regnavit. In ipsa igitur æstate [c] qua regnare[5] coepit in Mannia ad insulanas partes cum omnibus optimatibus suis transfretavit, constituitque Loglennum[6] quendam de consanguineis suis custodem Manniæ, donec rediret de insulis, veniensque ad insulas gaudenter et honorifice ab insulanis susceptus est. In sequenti auptumpno (!)[7] misit Haraldus tres filios Nel, Dufgaldum,[8] Thorquellum, Molmore, et quendam amicum suum, Joseph nomine, ad Mannian, et applicuerunt[9] apud insulam Sancti Patricii. Facta est igitur in vicesima quinta[10] die mensis Octobris, quæ fuit tertia dies adventus filiorum Nel ad Manniam, congregatio totius Mannensis populi apud Tingualla, ad quam congregationem venerunt tres filii Nel cum omnibus viris, quos secum de insulanis partibus adduxerant. Venit et[11] prædictus Loglennus custos Manniæ cum omnibus amicis suis et universis, quos ipsa die sibi associare potuerat, ad locum concionis, timebant enim filios Nel eo quod inimicitiæ essent inter eos. In ipsa[12] igitur concione, cum diu in alterutrum inimicitiæ verba jactarent, et acri verborum certamine litigarent, nullatenus ad concordiam flecti possent, de conventu populi exilierunt, et in alterutrum hostiliter irruerunt: prævaluerunt quoque viri, qui cum

[1] J. Leodhus. O. Lodivus.
[2] J. and O. *omit* usque ad obitum, *add* adeptus est.
[3] J. *adds* et.
[4] J. and O. *omit* que.
[5] J. regnum.

is Olave and Godred Don) the kingdom of Man and of the Isles. Olave received Man for his share, but Godred going to the insular portion of the kingdom, was slain in the island of Lewis. After Godred's death, Olave held the kingdom of Man and the Isles, for the remainder of his life.

In the year 1237, on May 21st, died Olave, son of Godred, King of Man and the Isles, at the island of St. Patrick. He was buried in the abbey of St. Mary of Rushen. Olave reigned eleven years, two during the life of his brother Reginald, and for nine years afterwards he had possession of the whole kingdom. After his death Harold his son reigned in his place. Harold was fourteen years old when he began to reign, and he reigned twelve years. In the same summer in which his reign commenced, he passed over, with all his chiefs, to the Isles, leaving Loughlin, a relative of his, guardian of Man, until his return. He was received with great satisfaction by the inhabitants, who paid him every honour.

In the following autumn Harold sent the three sons of Nel, Dugald, Thorkel, and Molmore, with a friend of his called Joseph, to Man. They put in at the island of St. Patrick. On the 25th day of the month of October, the third after the arrival of the sons of Nel, a meeting was held of all the people of Man at Tynwald, at which the three sons of Nel, with the followers they had brought from the Isles, attended. Loughlin also, the guardian of Man, with all his friends, and every person he could persuade to accompany him, went to the meeting, for they distrusted the sons of Nel, because there was a feud between them. At the meeting, after much hostile altercation and bitter contention, they were unable to come to terms, rushed out of the assembly, and came to blows. The followers

[6] J. *omits* Loglennum *in the text, but inserts it in the margin.*
[7] J. autumno. [8] J. Dufgalldum. [9] J. appulerunt.
[10] J. xxiv. [11] J. etiam. [12] J. ista.

[a] [See note 38, p. 197.] [b] [See note 39, p. 198.] [c] [See note 40, p. 198.]

Loglenno fuerant, et occiderunt in eodem loco duos filios Nel, Dufgaldum[1] et Mormore (!)[2] et prædictum Joseph amicum Haraldi regis ; ceteri vero fugerunt. Quo facto, concio populi dissoluta est, et unusquisque in domum suam reversus est. In sequenti vernali tempore venit Haraldus de insulanis partibus ad Manniam, applicuitque apud portum qui dicitur Rognalwac (!).[3] Eodem[4] die Loglennus cum omnibus suis a facie Haraldi fugiens, ad partes Valliæ navigaverat ; tulitque secum Godredum Holavi (!)[5] filium alumpnum suum, puerum bonæ indolis. Peracta igitur ipsa die navigando, et ampliori parte noctis, finibus Valliæ appropinquabant. Cumque voluntatis suæ portum cuperent introire, subito factus est illis ventus contrarius ; et orta tempestate valida a desiderato portu repulsi sunt, et in eisdem finibus, in quodam scopuloso loco, naufragium pertulerunt. Loglennus igitur cum fere primus terram ascenderet, et Godredum alumpnum suum clamantem post tergum exaudisset, resiluit in navem, volens dare animam suam pro puero. Cumque puerum amplexaretur et summo conamine eum ad aridam vellet deducere, a superioribus tabulis navis ad inferiora delapsi ambo pariter submersi sunt. Erat enim navis tota usque ad superiores tabulas impleta fluctibus ; ita ut non tam navis inter undas, quam undæ jam[6] intra navem esse viderentur. Submersi sunt cum eis alii circiter xl viri, vix totidem liberatis.

Anno MCCXXXVIII. Gospatricius[7] et Gillescrist (!)[8a] filius Murkerthac,[9] missi a rege Norwegiæ, venerunt ad Manniam, et expulso Haraldo a regno Manniæ, eo quod curiam regis Norwegiæ adire recusavit, totius patriæ principatum obtinuerunt, tributa regalia ad opus regis Norwegiæ capientes.[b] Venit igitur semel et iterum Haraldus ad Manniam, et obsistentibus ei in littore prædictis principibus

[1] J. and O. Dugaldum. [2] J. Molmore. [3] J. Rognalwath. O. Rognalswac. [4] O. Eadem. [5] J. Olavi. [6] J. and O. *omit* jam. [7] J. Gospatric. [8] J. Gillechrist. [9] J. and O. Mac-Kerthac.

[a] [See note 41, p. 199.]

of Loughlin prevailed, and slew on the spot two of Nel's sons, Dugald and Mormore, with the above mentioned Joseph, the friend of King Harold, whilst the rest escaped by flight. The meeting then broke up, and each one returned to his home. The following spring Harold came from the Isles to Man, and put in at the port of Ronaldsway. The same day Loughlin, with all his followers, flying from Harold set sail for Wales, and took with him his ward Godred, son of Olave, a youth of good promise. Having spent the day and great part of the night on the voyage, they came near to Wales, but endeavouring to enter the port they had determined upon, they were prevented from doing so by a violent storm which suddenly arose, and were shipwrecked on a rocky place in the same neighbourhood. Loughlin was amongst the first to land, but hearing behind him the cries of his ward, jumped on board again, ready to sacrifice his life for the boy. Seizing the youth in his arms he made great efforts to bear him to the shore, but falling from the upper to the lower parts of the vessel they were both drowned. The whole ship, indeed, was filled with water up to the highest planks, so that the appearance was not that of a vessel in the waves, but of waves in the vessel; about forty others were drowned, and scarcely that number saved.

In the year 1238, Gospatrick, and Gilchrist the son of Murkerthac, were sent to Man by the King of Norway to dethrone Harold, because he refused to present himself at the Court of Norway. They took possession of the whole country, and collected the revenues for the use of the King of Norway. Harold made two expeditions to Man, but was met on the

[b] [As Harold refused to acknowledge his dependence upon Norway, Gospatrick and Gilchrist M'Erchar, whose names appear to mark them as members of the Clan Lagman, or Lamond family in Cowal, whose Gaelic name was Mac Erchar, obtained a grant of the kingdom from Haco; and two years elapsed before Harold, carrying his submission to the Court of the offended king, was reinstated in his ancestral dominions."—Robertson, ii. 102.]

Gospatricio et Gillescrist cum exercitu suo, nec terram ascendere permissus est, nec quicquam ei necessarium concessum est ministrari. Rediensque ad Insulas ibidem moratus est.

Anno MCCXXXIX. Haraldus, sano et utili accepto consilio, adiit curiam domini regis Norwegiæ et ibidem duobus annis et amplius morabatur; peracto igitur tanto tempore apud regem Norwegiæ invenit tandem gratiam in conspectu ejus, et constituit eum regem super omnes insulas, quas Godredus, Reginaldus, et Olavus antecessores ejus possidebant, et eas sub sigilli sui munimine ei et successoribus, suis hæredibus, in perpetuum confirmavit.

Anno MCCXL. Obiit Gospatricius apud ecclesiam Sancti Michaelis sepultusque in Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin.

Anno MCCXLII. Haraldus Olavi filius, confirmato sibi regno Manniæ et Insularum a domino rege Norvegiæ, rediit de Norvegia ad insulanas partes, ubi collecta navium multitudine venit ad Manniam cum magno exercitu; et applicuit apud insulam Sancti Patricii, venitque universus populus Manniæ obviam illi in pace, et eum cum magno gaudio susceperunt. Videns autem Haraldus quod eum tam benigne Mannenses susceperunt, omnes quos secum de insulis adduxerat, datis illis cibariis, remisit ad propria, coepit quoque[1] ex isto[2] tempore quiete et pacifice regnare in Mannia, habuitque pacem firmissimam cum rege Angliæ et rege Scotiæ, et confoederatus est illis in amicitia.

Anno MCCXLVII. Haraldus miles factus[a] est a Domino Henrico rege Angliæ, a quo et pater ejus; et cum multo honore et magnis muneribus ab eo dimissus, venit ad propria.

Eodem anno misit rex Norwegiæ propter Haraldum, ut ejus curiam adveniret. Qui statim tempore autumpnali[3] iter arripiens per Angliam venit Norvegiam, et honorifice

[1] J. coepitque. [2] O. ipso. [3] J. autumnali.

[a] [See note 42, p. 199.]

shore by the above said chiefs, Gospatrick and Gilchrist, with their army, and was prevented from advancing into the country, and also from obtaining any necessary supplies, and consequently returned to the Isles and resided there.

In the year 1239, Harold, following wise and prudent counsel, went to the Court of the Lord King of Norway, and remained there upwards of two years. Having spent so long a time at the Court, he at length obtained favour in the eyes of the King of Norway, who appointed him king over all the islands which had been held by Godred, Reginald, and Olave, his predecessors, and confirmed the grant to him and his heirs for ever under the royal seal.

In the year 1240, Gospatrick died at the church of St. Michael, and was buried in the abbey of St. Mary of Rushen.

In the year 1242, Harold, son of Olave, having had his possession of the kingdom of Man and the Isles confirmed by the Lord King of Norway, returned from Norway to the Isles, where he collected a great number of ships and a large army, with which he went to Man, and put in at the island of St. Patrick, whither the whole population of Man came to meet him peaceably, and received him with great demonstrations of satisfaction. Harold finding himself so well received by the inhabitants of Man, supplied his followers from the Isles with provisions, and sent them home. From this time he reigned quietly and peacefully, established the most solid peace with the Kings of England and of Scotland, and was united to them by friendly alliance.

In the year 1247, Harold was made knight by the Lord Henry King of England, who had conferred the same honour on his father. He returned home from England laden with parting presents.

The same year the King of Norway summoned Harold to his Court. Harold immediately started during autumn, passing through England to Norway, where he was received with

suscepit eum Dominus rex Norvegiæ, deditque ei filiam suam in matrimonium ; et addidit ut magnificaret eum et exaltaret thronum regni ejus super omnes qui ante eum regnabant in partibus insulanis.

Eodem anno[a] obiit beatæ memoriæ Symon Sodorensis episcopus pridie kal. Martii apud ecclesiam Sancti Michaelis Archangeli, sepultusque est in insula Sancti Patricii in ecclesia scilicet Iermani (!)[1] quam ipse ædificare ceperat. Mortuus est autem anno pontificatus sui octavodecimo in senectute bona. Quo mortuo communi consilio et assensu totius Mannensis Capituli Laurentius quidam, qui tunc Archidiaconus fuit in Mannia, in Episcopum[2] electus est. Qui statim ad Norwegiam profectus est, ut se Haraldo regi et Nidrosiensi Archiepiscopo, a quo consecrari debuerat, præsentaret. Sed Haraldus, propter quasdam literas, quæ contra illum de Mannia transmissæ fuerant, nullatenus electioni ejus assensum præbere voluit, donec iterum cum eo rediret ad Manniam, et ipso præsente ab omni clero et populo eligeretur.

Anno MCCXLIX. Haraldus[b] Olavi filius rex Manniæ et Insularum cum uxore sua filia regis Norvegiæ et cum prædicto Laurentio electo Manniæ et Insularum, et cum multis aliis nobilibus viris, venit de Norvegia circa festum Sancti Michaelis Archangeli, redire volens ad propria ;[3] cumque venisset prope fines Iadlandie,[4] exorta tempestate valida, naufragium pertulit, et cum omni comitatu suo submersus[5] est ; cujus interitus causa doloris extitit[6] omnibus qui noverant eum. Cui successit Reginaldus frater ejus in regnum.

Anno MCCXLIX.[c] (1249). Coepit Reginaldus Olavi filius regnare in Mannia pridie nonas Maji ; et tricesima die mensis ejusdem, tertio videlicet kal. Junii, occisus est ab Yuaro

[1] J. and O. Germani. [2] J. and O. in episcopatum.
[3] J. ad patriam. [4] J. Radlandiæ. [5] O. summersus.
[6] J. *omits* extitit, and *inserts* erat.

honour by the King of Norway, who gave him his daughter in marriage, and added that he would greatly exalt him, and raise the throne of his kingdom above all that it had been in the days of his predecessors in the kingdom of the Isles.

In the same year died Simon, of blessed memory, Bishop of the Isles, on the last day of February, at the church of St. Michael the archangel. He was buried in the island of St. Patrick, in the church of St. Germanus, which he had himself commenced. He died in the 18th year of his episcopacy, at a good old age. After his death one Lawrence, then archdeacon in Man, was elected bishop, by common counsel and assent of the whole Chapter of Man. He immediately set out for Norway to present himself to King Harold, and the Archbishop of Drontheim from whom he had to receive consecration. But Harold, on account of something that had been written to his prejudice from Man, refused to consent to the election till Lawrence should return with him to Man, and be elected in the presence of the king by all the clergy and the people.

In the year 1249, Harold, Olave's son, King of Man and the Isles, with his wife, daughter of the King of Norway, and the above named Lawrence, Bishop-elect of Man and the Isles, and with many other notabilities, set out on his return home from Norway, about the feast of St. Michael the archangel; when they were near Shetland a violent storm arose, and the king, with all his company, was shipwrecked and drowned. His death was much lamented by all who knew him. Reginald his brother succeeded to the throne.

In the year 1249, Reginald began to reign on the 6th of May, and on the 30th of the same month was slain by the

[a] [See note 43, p. 200.] [b] [See note 44, p. 200.] [c] [See note 45, p. 203.]

milite, et a suis, in prato quodam prope ecclesiam Sanctæ Trinitatis in Russin ad australem partem ejusdem ecclesiæ, sepultusque est in ecclesia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin. Quo mortuo, Haraldus filius Godredi Don cepit regnare in Mannia.

Eodem tempore [a] Alexander rex Scotiæ coadunavit navium multitudinem copiosam, subjicere[1] sibi volens regnum omnium insularum; cumque pervenisset ad insulam, quæ vocatur Kerwaray, ibi febre correptus mortuus est. Cujus[2] corpus ad monasterium Melrosense translatum, ubi honorifice traditum est sepulturæ. Coepitque Alexander filius ejus, cum adhuc puer esset, regnare pro eo.

Haraldus igitur filius Godredi Don nomen regis et dignitatem sibi usurpans in Mannia, omnes fere principes Haraldi regis Olavi filii exules fecit; et profugos ejus principes et optimates pro eis constituit.

Miraculum de Sancta Maria.

Fuit[3] quidam Princeps Dofnaldus nomine vir grandævus et nobilis, qui præ[4] ceteris specialis exstitit[5] Haraldo Olavi filio. Hic igitur insecutionem Haraldi filii Godredi Don fugiens, venit cum filio suo puerulo[6] ad monasterium Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin. Venit et prædictus Haraldus post eum ad monasterium; et quia vim ei in loco sancto inferre non potuit, blandis ac deceptoriis[7] verbis eum allocutus est dicens: "Ut quid sic fugere voluisti? Nihil mali tibi inferre cogito," et mediante juramento promisit ei securitatem, et ut libere quocunque vellet iret per patriam persuasit. Credidit homo juramento regis et fidei, et secutus est eum de monasterio. Post modicum temporis rex iniquo usus consilio, sui et juramenti oblitus et fidei, prædictum hominem comprehendi fecit et vinciri, ac vinctum duci in insulam quandam, quæ sita est

[1] O. subicere. [2] J. hujus corpus. [3] O. *adds* autem. [4] J. and O. pro. [5] O. extitit. [6] J. parvulo. [7] J. deceptoribus.

knight Ivar and his accomplices, in a meadow near the church of the Holy Trinity at Rushen. He was buried in the church of St. Mary of Rushen. After his death Harold, son of Godred Don, began to reign in Man.

At the same time Alexander, King of Scotland, collected a large number of ships, with the view of subduing the whole kingdom of all the islands. He reached the island called Kerrera, where he was attacked by fever and died. His body was carried to the monastery of Melrose, and there intombed with honour. His son Alexander, yet a boy, succeeded him.

Harold, the son of Godred Don, usurping the name and dignity of king in Man, drove out nearly all the chiefs of Harold, Olave's son, and in their stead made the fugitives who had joined him chiefs and nobles.

The Miracle of St. Mary.

There was a certain aged chief of the name of Donald, a particular friend of Harold son of Olave. To escape the persecution of King Harold, son of Godred Don, he fled with an infant son to the monastery of St. Mary of Rushen. Harold followed him to the monastery, and unable to use force within the holy precincts, addressed him with gentle and deceitful speech, "Why dost thou thus fly from me? I intend thee no injury," and promised on oath that he should be unmolested, and allowed to go wheresoever he chose in his country. The man, trusting the oath and honour of the king, followed him out of the monastery. After a short interval, the king, led on by evil thoughts, and forgetful of his oath and word, ordered the said man to be seized, bound, and imprisoned in an island in the forest of Mirescog, and

[See note 46, p. 203. Alexander died 8th July 1249. He began his reign in 1214.]

in bosco[1] de Mirescohc,[a] deputatis ei multis custodibus. Erat igitur prædictus princeps fiduciam magnam habens in Domino. Quotiens vero opportune potuit, genua flectebat Domino ut eum intercessione beatæ Mariæ virginis matris ejus, de cujus monasterio fraudulenter ereptus fuerat, a vinculis liberaret. Nec defuit ei divinum auxilium. Quadem nempe[2] die, cum sederet in domo cum duobus solis hominibus, ceteris egressis ad negotia sua, subito catena[3] de pede ejus cecidit, et liberam ei fugiendi tribuit facultatem, sed[4] cogitans secum, quod expeditius in nocte dormientibus custodibus fugere potuisset, in catenam pedem reponere cogitabat, sed minime potuit. Perpendens igitur quod hoc divino nutu gestum esset, strinxit se tunica et chlamyde,[5] et foras exiliens fugam petiit. Videns alter eum[6] custodum, qui pistoris gerebat officium, surrexit subito et secutus est eum; cumque paululum processisset, cupiens comprehendere fugientem, cecidit super quendam truncum ligni, et semifracto crure, qui paulo ante currere conabatur, manifesta dei virtute nunc stare non potuit. Homo autem per dei gratiam liberatus venit tertia die ad monasterium Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin, gratias agens deo et misericordissimæ matri ejus pro liberatione sua. Hæc sicut ab ore ejus didicimus, scripsimus.

Anno MCCL. Haraldus[b] filius Godredi Don vocatus per literas adiit curiam domini regis Norwegiæ, iratusque est ei rex eo quod regnum sibi non debitum usurparet arripere,[7] detinuitque eum in Norwegia; in proposito habens, ut ei[8] ad Sodorenses partes ultra redire non permitteret. Eodem anno Magnus Olavi filius et[c] Johannes filius Dugaldi[9] et quidam Norvegienses

[1] J. in lacu de Mirescoge. [2] J. quodam nempe. O. quadam namque. [3] J. and O. cathena. [4] J. *omits* sed, *inserts* et. [5] J. and O. clamide. [6] O. *omits* eum. [7] J. *omits* arripere. [8] J. eum. [9] J. Dugald.

[a] [May this have been a Cranoge or Lake Island? Insulation in a lake island, says Burton, is an ancient method of defence amongst a people who did not know how to enclose themselves with stone walls. Artificial islands were frequently made of stakes and stones, on which were raised

guarded by numerous keepers. The above named chief, however, had great confidence in the Lord. Whenever it could be done conveniently, he besought the Lord on his knees to deliver him from his bonds, through the intercession of his Blessed Mother the Virgin Mary, from whose monastery he had been treacherously taken. Nor did divine assistance fail him. One day when he was sitting in the house with only two guards, the rest having gone out to look after their own affairs, all at once the chains fell from his foot, and left him free to escape. Reflecting, however, that he would have a better chance of success if he fled in the night while his guards were asleep, he endeavoured to replace his foot in the chain, this, however, he was not able to do. Considering, therefore, that what had happened was the effect of divine interposition, he girded himself in his tunic and cloak, and hastening out from the house fled away. One of the guards, who was engaged in baking, perceiving his attempt, rose and followed, but had not gone far when, anxious to arrest the fugitive, he stumbled over a log and nearly broke his leg, so that, instead of continuing to run, he had become, through the power of God, unable to stand. The prisoner, thus liberated by the divine favour, came on the third day to the monastery of St. Mary of Rushen, thanking the Almighty, and his most compassionate mother for his freedom. We have written the above as we had it from his own lips.

In the year 1250, Harold son of Godred Don was summoned, and went to the Court of the Lord King of Norway; for the king was displeased with his having usurped a kingdom to which he had no title, and intended not to allow his return to the Sodor Islands. In the same year Magnus son of Olave, and John son of Dugald, with some Norwegians,

not merely garrisoned fortresses but dwellings for families. An island so constructed, in deep water, was impregnable against an enemy who had not the command of boats. In Ireland they were called Cranoges.—i. 97, 98.]

[a] [See note 47, p. 205.] [b] [See note 48, p. 206.]

venerunt ad Manniam, applicueruntque apud portum, qui dicitur Rognalswaht;[1] misitque Johannes filius Dugaldi nuntios ad populum Manniæ, qui dicebant: "Hæc et hæc mandat vobis Johannes rex insularum." Quod cum audissent Mannenses, Johannem regem insularum nominari, et non Magnum, filium Olavi, indignati sunt valde; et ultra verba nuntiorum audire noluerunt. Reversi[2] nuntii indicaverunt hæc domino suo Johanni, qui statim, indignatus non modice, fecit omnem suum armari exercitum, et armatum insulam Sancti Michaelis ascendere, dispositumque per turmas seriatim sedere fecerat, quasi mox profecturi essent[3] ad prælium, jussitque omnibus ut subsequentis diei primo diluculo parati forent congredi cum Mannensibus, nisi quicquid ab eis petierint ultro spoponderint[4] se daturos. Mannenses igitur contra se directas cernentes acies, audaciter ad littus[5] accesserant; et se e contra per turmas disponentes eventum rei viriliter exspectabant. Recedente autem maris rheumate,[6] quo insulæ aditus claudebatur, prædictus Johannes et qui cum ipso fuerant navibus suis recepti sunt, multis tamen adhuc per insulam evagantibus, aliis vero quæ victui[7] necessaria fuerant præparantibus. Advesperascente autem die, ecce quidam juvenis,[a] qui Yuarum militem comitabatur, cum multis de populo Insularum ingressi sunt et quosdam in ipso impetu homines occiderunt. Multi vero ad naves fugientes enatando submersi sunt. Hoc eis evenisse non ambigo merito superbiæ et magnanimitatis suæ, quia oblatam sibi pacem a populo terræ recusabant accipere. Mandavit enim eis[8] populus Manniæ prima hora diei per internuntios dicens: "Quotquot a latere Domini regis Norwegiæ missi estis literas ejus nobis ostendentes terram securi ascendite, et quicquid nobis a sua clementia mandatum fuerit libenti animo faciemus." Sed ipsi nec literas ostenderunt, nec responsum pacis

[1] O. Rognalswath. [2] O. Reversique. [3] J. *omits* essent. [4] J. sposponderint.

came to Man, and put in at the port of Ronaldsway. John, son of Dugald, sent messengers to the people of Man to say "Thus, and Thus, does John King of the Isles command you." When the Manxmen heard John styled king of the Isles, instead of Magnus, Olave's son, they became indignant, and refused to hear anything further from the messengers, who returned and reported all to their master. John, greatly exasperated, immediately ordered his followers under arms, and led them up to St. Michael's isle, where he marshalled them in troops, and made them sit down in ranks prepared to engage in battle, and ordered all to be in readiness to commence the attack at break of day, unless the Manxmen would spontaneously promise to yield all he should ask from them. The Manxmen, seeing the troops drawn up in hostile array, descended boldly to the shore, and arranging themselves in corresponding bodies manfully awaited the result. During the ebb of the tide which barred the approach to the island, John and his followers betook themselves to their ships, leaving many however, who were dispersed through the island, or who were engaged in preparing provisions. In the evening a certain young follower of Sir Ivar with many of the men of the Isles entered the island and slew at the first onset many, while others were drowned in endeavouring to swim to the ships. This happened to them I have no doubt on account of their pride and insolence in refusing to accept the terms of peace offered by the natives; for the people of Man sent messengers at the first hour of day to say to them, "Let those from amongst you who are sent by the King of Norway come on shore without fear, and exhibit to us the royal letters, and we will cheerfully do whatever his Clemency commands. But they neither showed the letters nor

[5] O. litus.
[6] J. and O. reumate.
[7] J. *omits* victui, *adds* mensis.
[8] J. and O. iis.
[a] [See note 49, p. 206.]

dederunt, nec quicquam, quod iis a populo terræ oblatum fuerat, recipere voluerunt; crastina autem die cum indignatione magna[1] de Mannia recedentes multos nobiles exorta tempestate naufragio perdiderunt.

Anno MCCLII. Venit iterum Magnus filius Olavi ad Manniam, et susceperunt eum omnes Mannenses cum gaudio regemque sibi constituerunt.

Anno MCCLIII. Magnus Olavi[a] filius profectus est ad curiam domini regis Norwegiæ et honorifice susceptus est ab eo, mansitque apud eum uno anno.

Anno MCCLIV. Háco rex Norvegiæ constituit Magnum filium Olavi regem super omnes insulas, quas[2] antecessores ejus jure hæreditario possidebant, et eas ei et successoribus suis hæredibus, ut melius Haraldo fratri ejus, sigilli sui munimine in perpetuum confirmavit. Audiebant et videbant hæc adversarii ejus, et consternati animo contabescebant pereunte spe illorum. Magnus igitur rex Manniæ et Insularum constitutus a domino rege Norvegiæ cum magno honore dimissus venit ad propria.

Anno MCCLVI.[b] Magnus rex Manniæ et Insularum adiit curiam domini regis Angliæ, quem dominus rex Angliæ gratanter et honorifice susceptum militem fecit, et cum multo honore ac preciosis muneribus dimisit ad propria.

Anno MCCLVII. Dedicata est ecclesia[3] Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin a venerabili domino ac patre Ricardo, Soderensi Episcopo, anno pontificatus ejus quinto, præsente Domino Magno rege Manniæ et Insularum anno regni ejus quinto, Abbate autem domino Symone.[c]

[d]Anno domino MCCLXIII. Venit Háco[e] rex Norwegiæ ad partes Scotiæ, et nihil expediens reversus est ad Orcades, et ibidem apud Kyrkewa[4] mortuus, et sequenti vernali tempore

[1] O. maxima. [2] J. quam. [3] J. ecclesiæ. [4] J. Kirkwall. O. Kyrkewal.

[a] [See note 50, p. 206.] [b] [See note 51, p. 207.]

[c] [See charter, and correction of its date.—Oliver, *Mon.* ii. 89-98.]

made any overtures for peace, nor received any that were offered by the Manx people ; and retiring next day in great wrath from Man they lost many of their chiefs by shipwreck in a storm which arose.

In the year 1252 Magnus, son of Olave, returned to Man, where all received him with great joy, and appointed him king.

In the year 1253 Magnus, son of Olave, went to the Court of the Lord King of Norway, where he was received with great distinction, and remained a year.

In the year 1254 Háco, King of Norway, appointed Magnus, son of Olave, king over all the islands held by his predecessors, in virtue of hereditary right, and confirmed the grant under the royal seal to him and to his successors by inheritance, for ever, as had been previously done in the case of his brother Harold. When the enemies of Magnus saw and heard all this, they were confounded and dismayed by the destruction of their hopes. Magnus was thus appointed King of Man and the Isles, by the Lord King of Norway, by whom he was dismissed with great honour, and returned home.

In the year 1256 Magnus, King of Man and the Isles, visited the Court of the Lord King of England, by whom he was very graciously received, made knight, and loaded with distinction, and splendid gifts on his departure.

In the year 1257 the church of St. Mary of Rushen was dedicated by the venerable Lord and Father Richard, Bishop of the Isles, in the fifth year of his episcopacy, in presence of the Lord Magnus King of Man and the Isles, in the fifth year of his reign, while Lord Simon was abbot.

In the year of our Lord 1263, Háco, King of Norway came to Scotland, but effecting nothing returned to the Orkneys, and died at Kirkwall. In the following spring his body was

[d] A different handwriting begins here in the MS.

[e] [See note 52, p. 207.]

delatus est in Norvegiam,[1] et sepultus[2] est in ecclesia Sanctæ Trinitatis apud Bergam.[3]

Anno Domini MCCLXV. viii kal. Decembris obiit Magnus, filius Olavi regis[4] Manniæ et Insularum, apud Castellum de Russyn, et sepultus est in Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin.

Anno MCCLXVI. Translatum est regnum Manniæ et Insularum ad Alexandrum regem Scottorum.

Anno MCCLXXIV. Coronatus est Edwardus rex Angliæ apud Londoniam.[5] Eodem anno celebratum est consilium generale apud Lugdunum sub Grẹgorio decimo. Eodem anno obiit Margareta regina Scottiæ, filia Henrichi[6] regis Angliæ, soror Edwardi regis. Jacet apud Dunfermeri (!).[7]

[a]Anno domini MCCLXXV. Septima[b] die mensis Octobris applicuit navigium Domini Alexandri regis Scottiæ apud Rognalwath ;[8] et sequenti die, ante solis ortum, commissum est prælium inter Mannenses et Scottos ;[9] et Scotti victores existentes occiderunt de Mannensibus in illo conflictu quingentos et triginta septem viros, unde quidam versificator :

L. decies, X. ter, et penta duo cecidere,
Mannica gens de te dampna[10] futura cave.

Anno domini MCCCXIII. Dominus[c] Robertus rex Scotiæ applicuit apud Ramsa[11] videlicet xviii die Maji, cum multitudine navium ; et die dominica sequenti transivit ad Moniales de Dufglas, ubi pernoctavit ; et die Lunæ sequenti fecit obsessionem circa castrum de Russyn,[12] quod castrum dominus Dungalli (!)[13] Mac Dowyl[14] tenuit contra prædictum Dominum regem usque diem Martis proximam post festum Sancti Barnabæ apostoli, et ipsa die dictus Dominus rex dictum castellum recepit.[15]

[d]Anno domini MCCCXVI. Die ascensionis Dominicæ mane

[1] O. Norwagiam. [2] O. sepultusque. [3] J. Bergen. [4] O. rex.
[5] J. Londinum. O. Londiniam. [6] J. Henrici.
[7] J. Dunfermlin. O. Dunfermerin. [8] O. *adds* in Mannia.

taken to Norway, and buried in the church of the Holy Trinity at Bergen.

In the year 1265, on November 24, died Magnus, son of Olave, King of Man and the Isles, at Rushen castle; he was buried in the abbey of St. Mary of Rushen.

In the year 1266, the kingdom of Man and the Isles was transferred to Alexander King of the Scots.

In the year 1274, Edward King of England was crowned at London. In the same year a General Council was held at Lyons under Gregory 10th. In the same year died Margaret, Queen of Scotland, daughter of Henry King of England, sister of King Edward; she lies buried at Dunfermline.

In the year 1275, on the 7th day of the month of October, a fleet of the Lord Alexander King of Scotland, put into Ronaldsway, and on the following day, before sunrise, a battle was fought between the Manxmen and the Scots, in which the Scots prevailing slew 537 Manxmen, hence the versifier's distich:

Ten L, thrice X, with five and two did fall,
Ye Manx beware of future evil's call.

In the year 1313, on the 18th of May, Lord Robert, King of Scotland, put in at Ramsay with a large number of ships, and on the following Sunday went to the nunnery at Douglas, where he spent the night, and on Monday laid siege to the castle of Rushen, which was defended by the Lord Dungali MacDowyle against the said Lord King till the Tuesday after the feast of St. Barnabas the apostle, on which day the said Lord King took the castle.

In the year 1316, on Ascension Day, at sunrise,

[9] J. and O. Scotos. [10] J. damna. [11] J. Ramso.
[12] J. Russin. [13] J. and O. Dungawi. [14] J. Dowal. [15] O. adquisivit.

[a] Another change in the handwriting, in cursive letters.

[b] [See note 53, p. 232.]

[c] [On this expedition, and the history of Mac Dowyl, see a paper in Vol. XV. of the Manx Society Series, p. 56. Also Tytler, vol. i. p. 256 and 294.]

[d] Again a change in the handwriting of the MS. takes place.

ad ortum solis Ricardus le Mandevile et fratres ejus cum aliis magnatibus et malefactoribus de Hybernia applicuerunt ad portum de Ranaldwath[1] cum navium multitudine ; et exercitum ad terram imposuerunt cum armis et vexillis et magno apparatu et terram petierunt vel sibi ministrari subsidium de victualibus, animalibus et argento, quia deprædati erant per hostes super eos continue debellantes. Sub hac forma ad terræ communitatem nuntios miserunt talia petentes. At communitas respondit se eisdem nihil velle dare sed eis in campo obviare debellando. Hi vero qui erant ab Hybernicis revertentes retulerunt qualiter Mannenses responderunt. Tunc irati Hybernici cantum[2] subito cecinerunt, et confestim paraverunt se ad prælium, et fecerunt sibi duas turmas[3] processeruntque erga Mannenses quousque venerunt sub latere montis de Warchfel (!)[4] in campo ubi quidam manebat nomine Johannes Mandevil, et ibi adinvicem[5] obviaverunt et commissum est bellum. In prima vero aggressione adinvicem[6] terga verterunt Mannenses, et ceciderunt in illo conflictu fere xl viri. Et Hybernici persecuti sunt eos in pedibus et in equis, et occiderunt et vulneraverunt magnam multitudinem, et spoliaverunt terram de melioribus bonis omnibus, et argentum multum diu absconditum in pluribus locis pace invenerunt. Post hæc venerunt ad Abbatiam de Russyn, et eam spoliaverunt tam de supellectilibus quam de bobus et ovibus, nihil omnino relinquentes ; et cum taliter per mensem perendinassent, impleverunt naves suas de melioribus rebus terræ, et ad propria sunt reversi.

[a] Hi fuerunt Episcopi qui episcopalem cathedram in Mannia susceperunt a tempore Godredi Crouan et aliquanto tempore ante.

Primus exstitit[7] antequam Godredus Crouan[8] regnare coepisset Roolwer[b] Episcopus qui jacet apud ecclesiam Sancti

[1] O. Ronaldswath. [2] O. *omits* cantum. [3] J. et. [4] O. Wardfel.
[5] J. adunatæ. O. adunatem. [6] J. adunate.
[7] J. and O. primus extitit. [8] J. Cronan.

Richard de Mandeville, with his brothers, and many others of note, and a body of malefactors from Ireland, put into the port of Ronaldsway with a large number of ships, and disembarking the troops, arms, banners, and appointments, demanded either a grant of land, or a supply of provisions, cattle, and money, because they had been ruined by the perpetual inroads of enemies. In this guise they sent messengers to the inhabitants, to present their demands. The people replied that they would give nothing, but were prepared to resist them in the open field; the Irish messengers returned and reported the answer they had received; upon this the Irish, roused to anger, immediately set up their war song, prepared for the contest, and advanced in two bodies against the Manxmen till they came along the side of Wardfel, to an open spot, where was the residence of one John Mandeville. Here the hostile parties met and fought. At the first onset the Manxmen turned and fled, leaving forty nearly men dead on the field. The Irish pursued, some on foot, and others on horseback, killing and wounding great numbers, plundering the country of its valuables, and discovering at leisure much money that had been long concealed in various places. They came afterwards to the abbey of Rushen which they plundered, seizing both the furniture and the herds and flocks, leaving absolutely nothing. When they had spent a month in this fashion, they loaded their ships with the choice plunder of the country and returned home.

The following were the bishops who occupied the Episcopal See in Man from the time of Godred Crouan, and some short time before.

Roolwer was the first bishop before the time when Godred Crouan began to reign. He lies buried in the church of St.

[a] [See note 54, p. 234.]

[b] [Cumming says he was consecrated bishop 1050. He was buried at St. Maugholds or Kilmachow.]

Machuti. Multi quidem a tempore beati Patricii, qui primus fidem catholicam prædicasse fertur Mannensibus, exstiterunt episcopi, sed ab ipso sufficit episcoporum memoriam inchoasse. Sufficit, dicimus, quod qui vel quales ante ipsum episcopi exstiterunt penitus ignoramus, quia nec scriptum invenimus, nec certa relatione seniorum didicimus.[a]

Post Roolwer exstitit Willelmus Episcopus.

Post Willelmum in diebus Godredi Crouan Hamondus filius Iole Mannicus genere episcopalem[1] suscepit cathedram.[b]

Huic successit in episcopatum Gamaliel Anglicus genere qui jacet apud Petarborch in Anglia.

Post hunc Ragnaldus Norwegiensis[2] genere Mannensem ecclesiam gubernandam suscepit. Huic primo tertiæ ecclesiarum Manniæ a personis concessæ fuerunt, ut deinceps liberi ab omni episcopali exactione fore potuissent.

Huic successit in episcopatum Cristinus Archadiensis genere qui jacet in Benchorensi monasterio.

Post hunc Michael Mannensis genere vir vitæ venerabilis, et clarus mitis[c] monachus quidem actu et habitu, pontificatum susceperat; et hic ultimum vitæ diem in bona senectute finiens apud Fontanas honorifice jacet.

[1] J. episcolam. [2] J. Norwegus.

[a] [Though later investigation has supplied somewhat more information than the chronicle professes to be able to obtain, as to the successors of St. Patrick in the episcopal charge of Man, yet our acquaintance with them is limited to very little more than the names of some, with very few details, and nothing certain as to their chronology. There is good ground, however, for hopes that the present fruitful study of Irish ancient records will throw light on the early ecclesiastical history of this Island, which seems to have received not only its first instruction in Christianity from Ireland, but also a continued succession of pastors for a considerable period. Perhaps Scottish records will supply similar means for illuminating that later and darker period during which Man appears to have been under the spiritual care of Iona. Perhaps the labours of the Welsh antiquarians may supply from monuments of the long period during which Man was ruled from Wales, the information required for arranging the fragments we already possess, in a connected series of events.]

[b] [Between William and Hamond Hardy's Le Neve puts Brandanus. John-

Maughold. There were, indeed, many bishops from the time of blessed Patrick, who is said to have been the first to preach the catholic faith to the Manxmen, but it is sufficient to have begun the account of the bishops from Roolwer. We say sufficient, because we are entirely ignorant who or what were the bishops before Roolwer's time; for we neither find any written documents on the subject, nor have we any certain accounts handed down by our elders.

After Roolwer, William was bishop.

After William, in the days of Godred Crouan,—Hamond, son of Iole, a Manxman, held the Episcopal see.

He was succeeded by Gamaliel an Englishman, who is buried at Peterborough, in England.

After him, Reginald, a Norwegian, received the government of the church of Man. He was the first to whom the incumbents in Man gave the thirds of the churches, that they might thence be free from any episcopal exactions.

He was succeeded by Christian, an Argyllshire man, who lies in the monastery of Bangor.

After him Michael of Man, a person of irreproachable life and distinguished merits, a monk in deed as well as in habit, received the episcopacy. He ended his days at a good old age, and is honourably interred at Fountains.

stone, in his *Celto-Normanicæ* puts Ammond McOlave in 1077, after William, and says that he was bishop at the time of the Norwegian Conquest. Stubbs, in his *Reg. Sac. Ang.*, calls him McAulay, and considers him to be the same as Wimund. The Bollandists say that he was consecrated at York between 1130 and 1139. Mr. Stubbs, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, May 1862, says that he was consecrated by Thomas II. of York, between 1109-1114; but it is more probable that he was consecrated by Thurston, who was Archbishop from 1114 to 1140, to whom the letter given in the Appendix, No. 3, was addressed by Olave, probably about 1134. Roger of Wendover calls him the first bishop, meaning probably after the union of the See of Man with that of the Isles. He had been a Monk at Savigny, then at Furness, and possibly at Rushen.]

* [The mark of contraction over the syllable *mi* in the MS. shows that the word should be *meritis*; a correction which would be required by the construction, and by the terms employed in the encomium.]

Huic successit Nicolaus Erchadiensis [1] genere qui jacet in monasterio Bencorensi.[2]

Post hunc Reginaldus vir nobilis de regali genere consecratus [3] episcopus, strenue gubernabat ecclesiam, qui et diuturna infirmitate fatigatus sed in languore continuo non deficiens, sed gratias agens Deo ultimum in confessione bona exhalavit spiritum, sepultusque est in Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Russin.

Huic successit Johannes filius Hefare in episcopatum qui per quoddam miserabile ignis infortunium et per incuriam [4] servientium suorum vitam finiens jacet apud Jerewos [a] in Anglia.

[b] Post hunc Symon [5] Erchadiensis genere vir magnæ discretionis et in sacris scripturis peritus Sodorensem rexit ecclesiam ; et hic apud ecclesiam Sancti Michaelis in senectute bona defunctus, et jacet in ecclesia Sancti Germani quam ipse ædificare coeperat, post cujus obitum vacabat episcopatus ferme [6] sex annis.

[c] Post Symonem [d] vero venerabilem Sodorensem episcopum Ricardus genere Anglicus Romæ ab Archiepiscopo Nidrosiensi consecratus Sodorensem rexit ecclesiam per viginti tres annos.[7] Et hic veniens a generali concilio MCCLXXIIII obiit apud Langalyver in Coplandia sepultusque est in monasterio Sanctæ Mariæ de Furness.

Post hunc Marcus genere [e] Galuadiensis [8] Sodorensem rexit ecclesiam per viginti quatuor annos nobilissime.[9] Exulatus [f] tum erat per Mannenses ob quam causam interdicta erat terra per tres annos. Postea autem rediit revocatus, et pro relaxatione [10] dictæ sententiæ dederunt de qualibet domo [g] fumigante unum denarium, quod tamen donarium [11] adhuc redditur antiqua ex consvetudine cuilibet antistiti succe-

[1] J. Archadiensis. [2] J. Benchorensi. [3] J. consecutus.
[4] O. *adds* etiam. [5] J. Simon. [6] J. fere.
[7] J. *adds* nobilissime. [8] J. Galwediensis. [9] J. *omits* nobilissime.
[10] J. per relaxtionem. [11] O. denarium.
[a] [See note 55, p. 243.] [b] [See note 56, p. 244.]

He was succeeded by Nicholas of Argyll, who is buried in the monastery of Bangor.

After him Reginald, a nobleman of the royal race, was consecrated bishop, and governed the diocese with energy. Labouring under constant infirmity, but never yielding to fatigue, giving thanks to God, he breathed his last, witnessing by his life to his faith, and was buried in the abbey of St. Mary of Rushen.

He was succeeded by John, son of Hefare, who through a melancholy accident, and the negligence of his servants, perished by fire, and lies buried at Jerewos in England.

After him Simon from Argyll, a man of great prudence, and well versed in Holy Writ, governed the Sodor church. Dying at a good old age at the church of St. Michael, he lies buried in the church of St. German, which he had himself begun. After his death the see was vacant for nearly six years.

After the venerable Sodor Bishop Simon, Richard, an Englishman, consecrated at Rome by the Archbishop of Drontheim, governed the Sodor diocese for twenty-three years. Returning from the general council, in the year 1274, he died at Langalyver, in Copeland, and was buried in the monastery of St. Mary of Furness.

After him Mark, a Galloway man, governed the Sodor diocese right nobly for twenty-four years, when he was driven out by the Manxmen, and on this account the island was placed under interdict for three years; after which he was recalled, and the Manxmen paid one penny for every house with a fireplace, in consideration of the interdict being removed. This grant is still made, by ancient usage, to every succeeding

[c] Another handwriting in the MS. begins here. [d] [See note 57, p. 248.]

[e] [See note 58, p. 249.] [f] Another handwriting begins here.

[g] [This smoke penny, Dr. Oliver remarks, remains a tax payable to this day in the Isle of Man.]

denti redeunti de insulis. Prædictus autem Marcus dapsilis et urbanus in senectute bona obiit; cæcus erat ac sepultus in ecclesia Sancti Germani in insula de Holm.

[a] Post hunc Alanus [b] genere Galvediensis Sodorensem rexit ecclesiam honorifice, qui obiit xv die mensis Februarii A.D. MCCCXX, et sepultus est in ecclesia beatæ Mariæ de Rothersay in Buth.

Cui successit Gillebertus MacLelan Galvediensis genere. Episcopus fuit Sodorensis per duos annos et dimidium et sepultus in ecclesia prædicta de Both.

Postea successit Bernardus [c] natione Scotus et sepultus est in monasterio de Kilwynyn in Scotia. Vixit in episcopatu quotuor annis.

Huic successit Thomas genere Scotus. Vixit in episcopatu octodecim annos et sepultus est in Scona in Scotia; obiit autem vigesimo die mensis Septembris A.D. MCCCXLVIII.

[d] Hic primus viginti solidos nomine procurationum de ecclesiis Manniæ extorsit.

Hic fuit primus qui decimas omnium alienorum de piscatura alecum rectoribus extorsit insulæ prælibatæ.

Anno domini MCCCXLVIII. Wilhelmus Russell [e] natione Mannicus Abbas monasterii Sanctæ Mariæ de Russyn electus est per clerum insulæ Manniæ in pastorem ecclesiæ Sodorensis in ecclesia cathedrali Sancti Germani in Mannia in Holmo[1] et consecratus est Avinione a Clemente Papa VI., atque primus electus Sodorensis ecclesiæ fuit consecratus per sedem apostolicam et confirmatus; nam omnes sui antecessores ab archiepiscopo Nidrosiensi videlicet metropolitano confirmari et consecrari assueverunt.

Obiit[f] autem vigesimo primo die mensis Aprilis MCCCLXXIV,

[1] J. Holm.

[a] Another handwriting begins in the MS.

[b] [See note 59, p. 251.]

[c] See some account of this bishop in the Appendix, No. 28.

bishop returning from the Isles. Mark was a liberal and courteous man. He died at a good old age, when he had become blind; and was buried in the church of St. German, in the island of Holm.

After him Allen, a Galloway man, governed with credit the diocese of Sodor, and died on the 15th day of the month of February, in the year 1320, and was buried in the church of the Blessed Mary of Rothesay, in Bute.

Gilbert MacLelan, a Galloway man, succeeded him. He was bishop of the diocese of Sodor for two years and a half, and was buried in the aforesaid church of Bute.

Bernard, a Scotchman, succeeded, and was buried in the monastery of Kilwinning, in Scotland. He lived four years in the episcopate.

He was succeeded by Thomas, a Scotchman, who held the episcopate eighteen years, and was buried at Scone, in Scotland, having died on the 21st day of September A.D. 1348.

He was the first to exact from the churches of Man twenty shillings for visitation dues.

He was also the first who exacted from the parochial Rectors the tythes received by them from strangers engaged in the herring fishery.

In 1348, William Russell, a Manxman, abbot of the monastery of St. Mary of Rushen, was elected pastor of the Sodor diocese, by the clergy of the island of Man, in the cathedral church of St. German, in Holm of Man, and was consecrated at Avignon by Pope Clement VI. He was the first Sodor bishop-elect consecrated and confirmed by the Apostolic see; for all his predecessors had been wont to be confirmed and consecrated by the Archbishop of Drontheim, that is the metropolitan.

He died on the 21st day of the month of April 1376, at

[a] Another handwriting begins. [b] [See note 60, p. 252.]

[f] [See note 61, p. 255.]

apud Ramsheved[a] et sepultus est in monasterio Sanctæ Mariæ de Furness, qui quidem fuit Abbas de Russyn xviii annis et vixit episcopus Sodorensis xxvi annis.

[b] Pridie mensis Junii die Jovis, festo videlicet corporis Christi, in ecclesia cathedrali Sancti Germani in Mannia, A.D. MCCCLXXIV, Johannes Donkan Mannensis quidam per clerum Manniæ est electus in pastorem et episcopum Sodorensem. Et in festo scilicet Sancti Leonardi proximo sequenti est Avenione per papam Gregorium XI. confirmatus; et in festo Sanctæ Catherinæ proximo sequenti apud fratres prædicatores per Cardinalem Prænestinum dudum Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem[1c] est solemniter cum aliis octo Episcopis consecratus. In festo autem conversionis Sancti Pauli A.D. MCCCLXXVI et suæ consecrationis tertio, in dicta sua ecclesia cathedrali fuit solempniter installatus, maximis oblationibus dicto die in sua prima missa pontificali acquisitis,[2] nam interim fuit apud Boloniam in [Pic] ardia strictis carcere et vinculis f . . . captus sed postea .d. marchis redemptus. . . . . .[d]

[1] J. and O. Carocuviacum.

[2] J. *omits* [nam . . . . . redemptus]. O. inserts the sentence in a note.

[a] [Ramsheved or Ramshead or Ramshved is in Lancashire. Edward III. granted the monks of Furness free warren in it. At the dissolution the monks had a yearly income of 10s. from it.—West's *Furness*, 55, 101, 108.]

[b] [See note 62, p. 255.]

[c] Corrected; in the MS. it is erroneously—Carocuviacum.

[d] [See note 63, p. 257.]

Ramsheved, and was buried in the monastery of St. Mary of Furness. He was abbot of Rushen eighteen years, and bishop of the Sodor diocese twenty-six.

On Thursday the 31st of May, A.D. 1374, which happened to be the festival of Corpus Christi, John Duncan, a Manxman, was elected by the clergy of Man to be pastor and bishop of Sodor, in the cathedral of St. German. On the following festival of St. Leonard he was confirmed by Pope Gregory XI., and on that of St. Catherine he was solemnly consecrated, with eight other bishops, at the church of the Friars' Preachers, by the Cardinal of Palestrina, formerly Archbishop of Canterbury. On the feast of the conversion of St. Paul, in the year of our Lord 1376, the third after his consecration, he was solemnly installed in his above-mentioned cathedral, receiving many very great offerings on that day, at his first pontifical mass. In the interval he had been kept in close confinement at Boulogne, in Picardy . . . but was afterwards liberated on payment of . . . marks. . . . .

NOTES.

NOTE 1, p. 44.—*Anno ob incarnatione—domini* M. . . *Anno* MXXIII.

ALL these entries are entirely taken from the *Chronica de Mailros*, as stated in the Preface; only every date is less by seventeen years than that originally entered in the *Chronica*. What may have been the cause of this alteration is very difficult to guess, especially as even the writer himself does not keep up the same difference throughout the whole time. In the next entry there is a difference from the right number of 19 years; which difference is kept up until A.D. 1093 (1073), where a new difference of 20 years begins, and lasts until 1102. From this year to the end we generally find the right number. For these reasons it is obvious that the writer cannot have adopted any peculiar era; it would seem that he has only committed blunders in reading the ciphers used to indicate the dates in the text he followed.[a]

NOTE 2, p. 50.

The real *Chronicles of Man*, or the entries belonging to the history of this kingdom, only commence with the year 1066 (1047). The first lines touching the death of King Edward the Confessor are still due to the *Chronica de Mailros*, the rest, however, is original. Here, therefore, Camden has also commenced his abridgment. The first King of Man here mentioned, viz. Godred son of Sytric, is not, however, the first known in history, but it was not the author's plan to carry the history farther up than to Godred Crowan, whom he probably supposed to be the founder of the reigning dynasty. Perhaps he did not even know of any King of Man previous to Godred the son of Sigtrygg, although the Icelandic family-sagas, as well as the Irish annals, speak of kings either in Man or in the Isles for more than a century earlier than the two Godreds here mentioned.

[a] [See the Chronological Table, Appendix, No. 58. From the text, and note 9, it would seem that the year given in this note as 1102 should be 1098.]

The great Norwegian invasion, which lasted from the end of the eighth to the middle of the ninth century, and caused the erection of Norwegian kingdoms in Ireland, comprised also the islands between Ireland and Scotland, and these were even more completely subdued and subjected to the Norwegian rule than any part of Ireland itself. Indeed, the Island of Man, and the southernmost islands west of Scotland, are to be regarded as the centre of the Norwegian settlements in these parts of Europe. From these islands, eminently fitted to serve as a stronghold for these hardy Vikings, whose strength consisted almost entirely in their large and well constructed ships, the tide of invasion flowed to the west, to the north, to the east, and passing through Cumberland and the territory of the Strath-Clyde Britons it even reached to the eastern parts of Britain, where it met with another current from the North, that of the Danes, with which it easily coalesced, although traces are not wanting of their early encounters in a manner far from friendly. Man, as well as the rest of the islands, seems for the first period either to have been subjected to the Norwegian kings of Dublin, or to have been ruled by several chieftains or vikings, who did not adopt the title of kings. In 852, Olaf the White, the Amhlabh of the Irish chronicles, descended from the same family as Harold Harfagri, the Fair-Haired, afterwards King of Norway, conquered Dublin, with the adjacent territory, and founded this, the most renowned, most powerful and most lasting Norwegian kingdom in Ireland.[a] Olaf was married to *Aude*, daughter of the mighty and valiant Norwegian baron *Ketil Flatnef* (flat-nose) from Sogn. This Ketil, it is said in some Sagas (as the *Landnáma*), was sent by King Harold of Norway

[a] [The footsteps of Olaf the White are traceable by bloodshed and plunder in the Irish annals. A.D. 853 or 852 he arrived with a prodigious fleet, and assumed the sovereignty of the foreigners of Erinn ; he was descended through the female line from Ragnor Lodbrok. It was by him that Conchobar, son of Donchadh, heir-apparent of Tara, was drowned. It was by this fleet that the battle of Cluandaimh was gained over the Desi, Co. Waterford, in which all the nobles of Desi fell. It was by them that the son of Cennfaeladh, King of Muscraighe-Breoghain, was killed, and Muchtighern, son of Rechtalrad, was smothered in a cave. It was by them that Maelguala, son of Dongaile, King of Cashel, was killed by breaking his back with a stone. In 865 Olaf transferred his depredations to Scotland, plundering all Scotland, and taking hostages. In 868 he returned to Ireland, and burned Armagh with its oratories, after making great havoc, and leaving 1000 men wounded or slain. In 869 he was at the siege and plunder of Dumbarton, capital of the Strath-Clyde Britons. In 870 or 871 he returned to Dublin with 200 ships, and a great number of prisoners, Angles, Britons, and Picts, etc. He was slain somewhere in Ireland about that time, as his name is no more mentioned in the Irish annals.—Todd, pp. 23, 230, 269. Dunham, i. 317.]

to chastise some Vikings who had taken up their abode in the Isles, although previously expelled by the king himself, and having executed his commission he made himself independent there; according to another and far more probable version of the story (that of the Laxdœla Saga), Ketil emigrated from Norway to the Isles because he was obnoxious to the king, and could not resist him in his own country. The marriage of his daughter with Olaf of Dublin, which must have taken place about 850, as their son was grown a man in 870, is sufficient to show that Ketil, although perhaps still chiefly resident in Norway, must have been a man of great consequence in those parts long before the king himself went there to expel the Vikings;[a] perhaps even he helped Olaf to make his conquests. All the Sagas, in which these events are mentioned, agree that King Harold Fair-hair made himself a great expedition to the islands near Scotland and Ireland against the Vikings there settled, who continued to infest the seas occasionally, even making attacks upon Norway, their mother country, and that in this expedition he conquered Shetland (*Hjaltland*), the Orkneys, the Sudreys (Hebudes), and even Man, killing or expelling the Vikings, who were not strong enough to make any serious resistance. From this expedition onwards, which seems to have taken place in the year 870, the later Norwegian kings derived their right or title to these islands, and as even now some stanzas remain of a poem in which these events were celebrated by the king's chief court-poet, who perhaps accompanied his master on this expedition, there can be no possible doubt of the thing having really taken place. The colonisation of Iceland, beginning about this time, and being chiefly effected by powerful Norwegian families, who did not come directly from Norway, but from the Sudreys, where they had lived for some years after their expatriation, and among whom the very Ketil Flatnef here mentioned occupies a prominent place, makes it almost certain that the immediate reason for the second transmigration of these men, with their whole families, was no other than King Harold's expedition. And, consequently, even that colonisation bears a strong evidence as to the truth of the ancient tale.

The Orkneys, with Shetland, King Harold gave as an hereditary earldom to Earl Ragnwald (Reginald) of More, in Norway, whose son Turf-Einar,[b] was the founder of the illustrious Orkneyan dynasty,

[a] [Ketil was leader of the Gallgael or Scotch Norsemen when Harfager was an infant, and appears to have succeeded Godfrey MacFergus, whose name betokens a mixed descent, and who died in 853. The Gallgael possessed the islands before the time of Harfager.—Robertson, i. 45 n. Dunham, i. 175.]

[b] [Einar is described as conspicuous for excessive ugliness, and the harshness

which continued in the unbroken male line for 300 years, when female succession brought the Atholl dynasty in from Scotland in its place, which, again, was followed by the Angus dynasty, and this at last by the family of St. Clair; all subsequent dynasties, however, deriving their right from their relation to the original Norwegian line. The Sudreys, including no doubt the Isle of Man, he confided to the care of an earl named *Tryggvi*, and, he having been killed, to another earl named *Asbjörn Skerjablesi*.[a] It is, however, obvious that the position of these earls must have been very precarious and dangerous, as they were far off Norway, and exposed to incessant attacks from the Vikings. Both of them came also to an untimely death; Tryggvi was first killed, as stated above, then Asbjörn was attacked by two relations of Ketil Flatnef, who killed him, captured his wife and daughter, and sold the latter as a slave. There are no traces of King Harold having sent a third earl to the islands. Perhaps even the death of Asbjörn Skerjablesi took place when the king was already grown old and not fit for expeditions like the former.

The immediate successors of King Harold did not, as far as we can see, maintain the suzerainty over the remote Sudreys and Man, and it is most probable, that the latter at least formed a part of the dominions of the successors of Olaf the White on the Norwegian throne of Dublin, who were unquestionably now the most powerful rulers on these seas. Olaf's and Aude's son, Thorstein the Red, even conquered a part of Scotland, as the Landnáma tells us. We can, namely, trace the power and influence of these kings beyond the sea to the coasts of Cumberland, and across the country to Northumberland;[b] where the Danes had made extensive conquests, and a branch of the royal Danish line, descended from the great conqueror Ragnar Lodbrok,[c] had established its throne at York.[d] When this branch was extinguished about 920, and the sub-

of his features was increased by the loss of an eye, but he succeeded after the failure of his brother Hallad, and successfully asserted his claims to the Orkneys. —Robertson, i. 80. Dunham, i. p. 179.]

[a] Landnáma IV. 1. 3. Droplaugarsuna Saga, p. 4.

[b] [The ancient kingdom of Northumbria extended from the river Mersey to the Clyde on the west, and from the Humber to the Firth of Forth on the east.]

[c] [For an account of Ragnar Lodbrog's exploits and death, see Ling. i. 181.]

[d] Guðröðr (or *Góðréd*) the son of Hardecnut, King of Denmark, and grandson of Lodbrok, was, according to Simeon of Durham and others, elected king of the Danes at York 882, and died 894 (according to Ethelwerd 896, the 25 August); as son of Hardecnut he was the brother of King Gorm in Denmark, who, indeed, seems to have been no other than the well-known Guðrum, who made peace with King Alfred in 878, and was baptized with the name of Athelstan, "Gormr, Gurmr," being a contraction of *Goðormr*, *Guðurmr*. [See Lingard, i. 193-204.]

ordinate Danish chieftains had submitted to Edward, son of king Alfred, the kingdom of York was given in fief by the English kings to princes from Dublin belonging to the royal race of Olaf the White. This, although not expressly stated, is still evident from various reasons. For when Ragnwald (Reginald) probably a son of Guðröðr son of Hardecnut († c. 894) was dead about 924,[a] there appears as his successor a king named Sigtrygg, who, immediately after the accession of Athelstane to the throne, went to him at Tamworth (Jan. 26, 926), did homage to him as his liege vassal, and was married to Athelstane's sister, but died next year, when Athelstane expelled his two sons (as it would seem by a former marriage, or illegitimate), Olaf (Anlaf) and Guðröðr (Güðred), and made himself master of Northumberland; and the Irish annals show that in the year of 920, just before the appearance of the Sigtrygg[b] here mentioned at York, Sigtrygg, King of Dublin since 917, was expelled from this place;[c] from this coincidence it is therefore to be inferred that he went over to Northumberland and profited by

The Danish historian Saxo speaks, (p. 468) of a *Gorm anglicus* who was first king in England, but went afterwards to Denmark, where he was succeeded by a Harold, and he again by *Gorm the old*, the husband of Thyre Danebot; the annals of Ry monastery (commonly called *Chronicon Erici regis*), say even that Gorm anglicus was christened in England (Langebek *Scriptt. R. D.*, i. p. 158). No ancient Sagas know of more than one Gorm, viz. Gormr hinn gamli (the old) son of Hardecnut. But as Hardecnut was the grandson of Ragnar Lodbrok, who died about 800, while Gorm the old died 936, having a son, the renowned Harold Bluetooth, who died 986, it is evident that the men who first wrote down the Sagas must have confounded the two Gorms with each other, and made one of them, thus dropping two links in the line of generations; for it is impossible that the space of time from 800 till 986 could have been filled with only four generations. Now, as Gudrum Athelstane is said in the *Chron. Saxonicum* to have died in 891, but in the year 906 a new Guðrum appears, who made with King Edward, Alfred's son, the treaty of Yttingaford (Thorpe's *Ancient Laws of England*, p. 71), and this Guðrum, according to Wallingford, was called from Denmark to England, we have here even the younger Gorm above mentioned.

[a] *Chron. Sax.*

[b] [A.D. 888, Sitric, called the blind or one-eyed, arrived in Dublin "with a prodigious royal fleet." In 902 or 903 he went to Scotland; recovered Dublin in 919 after a great battle, in which many Irish chieftains were slain. The next year he was forced to quit Dublin "by divine interposition." He appears to have landed in England and burned Davenport in Cheshire. In the *Saxon Chronicle* he is called King of the Northumbrians, and did homage to Athelstane for the country between the Tees and the Firth of Forth, which was already in his possession. He received the hand of Editha, sister of Athelstane, in marriage, received baptism, and died at the end of twelve months, A.D. 927, having abandoned, it was said, both his religion and his wife.—Todd, p. 279. Lingard, i. 231-2. Robertson, i. 59.]

[c] *Annals of Ulster*, O'Connor Rer. Hib. Scr. iii. p. 261.

the disturbances after the extinction of the royal line, and got possession of this country. Moreover, the name of Sigtrygg, being common and characteristic to the royal line of Dublin but foreign to the Danish line of York, there consequently is no great probability that king Sigtrygg's belonged to it, or, if that were really the case, he must at least have been descended from the Dublin kings on the maternal side. The well-known ecclesiastical Annalist, Mag. Adam of Bremen, says it is true that Gúðréd, the son of Hardecnut, was succeeded by his three sons, Olaf, Sigtrygg, and Reginald ;[a] but his authority is of no weight, as it is evident that he has known and used the *Chronicon Saxonicum*, and, in his uncritical way, believed all those kings, who were next mentioned as kings of York, to have been sons of that Gúðréd.

Olaf, the son of Sigtrygg, fled to Ireland, but his brother Gúðréd went to Constantine,[b] King of Scotland, and Eugene, lord of Cumberland, soliciting their assistance. Threatened by emissaries from Athelstane, they dared not comply with the wishes of Guðréd, and he was compelled to depend upon his own resources, supported only by a faithful friend, Thurfred ; they besieged York, but did not succeed, shortly afterwards they were taken prisoners and confined in a castle ; they escaped and went to sea, but Thurfred was drowned, and Guðréd, having met with many misfortunes, chose to throw himself on the mercy of Athelstane, and repaired to his court, where he indeed got a good reception ; but only for four days could the old Viking stand this quiet life, and "went back to his ships like a fish to the sea."[c] It seems that the battle of *Vinheid*, described at large and very spiritedly in the Egils-Saga, is one of the incidents of the feud here mentioned (only the Saga-author has probably made a little more of it than it really was), and not, as has been believed, the celebrated battle of Brunanburg, which took place in 938 ; at least the Egils-Saga itself says distinctly that the battle of Vinheid was fought shortly after the accession of Athelstane.[d]

[e] Olaf, the son of Sigtrygg, is not the only king of this name at that time appearing in the English and Irish annals, and making war against Athelstane. There was also another Olaf, son of the cruel Gúðréd,[f]

[a] Mag. Adamus, i. 41, and ii. 22.

[b] [Constantine II. who reigned from A.D. 900-943.]

[c] William of Malmesbury, ed. Savile, p. 50.

[d] Egils-Saga, cap. 51-56.

[e] [Olave Sitricson, or Olave Cuaran, or Olave of the sandal, or Olave the Red, is the Danish king who had married a daughter of Constantine. See his further history, note *c*, p. 7 of the Preface.]

[f] [Olave, the son of Godfrey or Godred, cousin of Olave Cuaran, succeeded his

King of Dublin, who left Dublin some time after the death of his father, A.D. 934, either expelled by his subjects or allured by the hope of getting possessions in Northumberland ;[a] but the annals here are so meagre and obscure, that in many cases it is impossible to see which of the two is meant, perhaps even the annalists themselves did not know. One of these Olafs was married to the daughter of Constantine, King of Scotland, and tried to get possession of Northumberland through his help ; and although Constantine had done homage to Athelstane, he was seduced by Olaf to shake off his allegiance, which caused Athelstane to make a great expedition against Scotland, A.D. 934. In this war Athelstane was successful, and compelled Constantine to submit anew, and give his son as a hostage for his future obedience.[b] A few years after, however, Constantine, as the annalists tell, prevailed on his son-in-law to attack England ; and it is to be inferred, from the greatness of the armament as well as from the importance which the entries in the old annals evidently assign to these events, and lastly from the *Epinicion* composed by the English poets to commemorate the victory of Brunanburgh (inserted at large in the *Chronicon Saxonicum*),[c] that all the Danish and Norwegian chiefs in the north of England and south of Scotland had formed a league to regain their former position in Northumberland, and that they were supported by their brethren from Ireland, and the Isles, as well as by Constantine. Certain it is, that the son-in-law of Constantine had amongst his auxiliaries his namesake, the other Olaf.[d] With 615 ships he landed in the Humber, accompanied by five kings besides Constantine, and seven earls. He was, however, totally defeated by Athelstane in the great battle of *Brunanburgh*, A.D. 938,[e] and the Norwegians, so says the ancient poem, were driven back to Dublin and Ireland.[f] The return to Dublin of Olaf

father in the government of the Irish Norsemen, A.D. 934. He is answerable for a long list of misdeeds. In 929 he plundered Kildare ; in 933 he plundered Armagh ; in 937 he carried off Olave with the scabby head, of Limerick, with the foreigners who were with him, after breaking their ships. On this occasion he plundered Clonmacnois, and quartered his soldiers there for two nights, a thing, says the annalist, hitherto unheard of. In 938 he was at the battle of Brunanburgh ; in 939 he plundered Kilcullen ; in 941 he is said to have plundered St. Balther's church, and burnt Tyningham in Scotland, and died there. Robertson says that he lost his life in some obscure skirmish near Tyningham, two years after the death of Athelstane, who died October 27, 941.—Ling. i. 242. Robertson, i. 67. Todd, 28.]

[a] *Annales Ulton.* p. 261.

[b] [Ling. i. 235. Robertson, i. 61.]

[c] [See Appendix, No. 54.]

[d] [Olave Sitricson.]

[e] [Ling. i. 235-237. Robertson, i. 63. Todd thinks that both Olaves returned to Ireland, p. 282.]

[f] *Chronicon Saxonicum.*

son of Gúgréd, is even mentioned in the Ulster annals ;[a] of the other Olaf, however, nothing is heard for the next years ; which corroborates the opinion stated above, that it was he who had married the daughter of Constantine, and therefore did not then go to Ireland, but returned to Scotland, where no annals are left to record his arrival. At the death of Athelstane, the annals proceed to tell us that the Northumbrians again revolted, and took Olaf from Ireland to be their king ;[b] and that Olaf was now successful, being supported even by the Archbishop Wulfstán. Both archbishops, Odo of Canterbury and Wulfstán of York, negotiated a treaty between Olaf and Eadmund, the successor of Athelstane, by which treaty Eadmund ceded to Olaf the ancient Danish kingdom north-east of Wætlingastræt, on condition that Olaf should embrace Christianity.[c] Olaf was really christened, and Eadmund himself acted as his godfather.[d] Shortly afterwards Olaf died, A.D. 943, and Eadmund now, it is said, expelled Reginald, the son of Gúðréd, probably the brother of Olaf,[e] who had also been christened, as well as Olaf the son of Sigtrygg, 944, which shows that this person had now returned to Northumberland, and that it was not he, but Olaf of Dublin, who concluded the treaty with Eadmund. Eadmund died in 946, and was succeeded by his brother Eádréd, who went immediately to Northumberland, and received the homage of the Archbishop and the principal Chiefs. Not long time afterwards, however, they rebelled anew, and took *Eric*, the son of Harold, to be their king.[f] It is evident that this Eric is no other than Eric Bloodaxe, the son of Harold Fairhair, King of Norway, who was expelled from his kingdom in the year 934. He is said by the Nor-

[a] *Annales Ulton.* p. 263.

[b] *Chron. Sax.* [c] *Chron. Sax.*, and Simeon Dunelmensis.

[d] [Both Olaves were in the expedition ; but Olave Sitricson was the principal, as Olave Godfreyson, his cousin, was King of Dublin. It was Olave Godfreyson who died in 943. Both Reginald and Olave (Anlaff Sitricson) submitted to Edmund, and embraced Christianity. Edmund stood godfather to Olave at baptism, and to Reginald at confirmation. Both reasserted their independence when Edmund left York, but both were driven out of the country by the united forces of Archbishop Woolstan and the Ealdorman of Mercia.—Ling. i. 246. Todd, 283-288. Robertson, i. 66.]

[e] [Reginald was the brother of Olave, for they were both sons of Godfrey, Godred, or Gothbrith, the brother of Sitric, the father of the other Olave ; hence, as has been previously stated, these two Olaves were cousins. Godfrey became King of Dublin, and probably of Waterford, in 921. In 927, on Sitric's death, he succeeded as King of Northumbria, but was expelled after six months by Athelstane. On his death, in 934, Reginald succeeded him as King of Dublin, and apparently in Northumbria. The date of his death is not recorded.—Todd, 279, 288.]

[f] *Chronicon Saxonicum.*

wegian sagas to have addressed himself immediately to King Athelstane, and to have received from him the kingdom of Northumberland, where he reigned peaceably till the accession of King Eadmund, who, it is said, did not like the Norwegians, and intended to give Northumberland to another king, which caused Eric to go away, join some Viking-kings in Ireland, and in their company to make an attack somewhere on the south of England, where he was killed. The statement of the English annals as to the events in Northumberland from the reign of Athelstane to the times of King Eádréd, show that the Norwegian account cannot be accurate, and that Eric did not make his appearance in Northumberland till 948, as above stated, and during the reign of Eádréd. Eric, the English annals say, was expelled by the Northumbrians themselves, terrified by the threats of Eádréd ; then came *Olaf Cvaran* from Dublin, who seems to be no other person than the Olaf Sigtryggson above mentioned, who was likewise made king, and afterwards expelled by the Northumbrians ; then Eric again returned, but was killed in a battle on the "Stone-moor" (Stánmór), 950.[a] The particulars of this battle, as given by Matthew of Westminster, bear still more witness as to the identity of this Eric,[b] Harold's son, with Eric Bloodaxe, son of the Norwegian Conqueror.[c] Since that time there were no northern kings in

[a] Matthæus Westmonast. p. 369 ; cfr. Hoveden, ed. Savile, p. 423 ; Mon. Hist. Brit. i. p. 687, note d.

[b] [Robertson and Dunham, following the sagas, which are often incorrect about matters happening outside of Norway, allege that Eric was appointed by Athelstane to the kingdom of Northumbria, on condition that he would hold it against the Olaves ; that, in the hour of invasion, Eric offered no resistance, but sailed away, and entered upon a course of piracy among the Western Isles ; that he subsequently returned to Northumbria, from which he was driven after two years ; that he perished in a skirmish on Stanemoor, slain by Magnus Haraldson, through the treachery of Osulf, who was rewarded with the earldom of Northumbria, whilst Man and the Hebrides fell to the share of Magnus. Lingard, following the English annals, states that Athelstane sent his "foster son" Haco, with a powerful fleet, to obtain possession of the sceptre of Norway, as Eric had lost the affection of his subjects ; that Eric, after wandering about as a pirate, landed in Northumbria, and was saluted king, A.D. 946 ; and that in 952 he perished in the wilds of Stanemoor by the treachery of Osulf, and the sword of Macco, the son of Olave. It is not, however, known that Olave had any son of that name. Todd, referring to Hodgson's *Northumberland*, i. 151, and to Lappenburg (Thorpe's translation), ii. 124, says that this Eric was not Bloodaxe, son of Harold Harfager, but Eric, son of Harold Blaatand, first christian king of Denmark.—Robertson, i. 65-82. Dunham, i. 184-188. Ling. i. 249-250. Todd, 267, n. 7.]

[c] Also Mag. Adam speaks of Eric, Harold's son, coming to England and being killed there ; he calls him Herric or Herring, but he believes him to have been a son of Harold, King of Denmark ; it is evident that even here Mag. Adam has

Northumberland, but the king gave it as an hereditary earldom to the heágeréfa Osulf, by whose treason the death of Eric is said to have been caused.

We have here dwelled at some length upon the history of the kingdom of Northumberland in its connexion with the kingdom of Dublin, because it is evident that it must somehow too, be the history of *Man*, this island, forming the intermediate step between Dublin and Cumberland, being also necessarily connected with either of the two. This is still more probable, as, since the downfall of the kingdom of York, we begin to meet with independent kings of Man or of the Isles, still, however, closely connected with those of Dublin ; and among the names of these kings, we find Godréd (*Guðröðr*), Harold, Sigtrygg, Olaf, all of them belonging to the lines of kings now mentioned, and showing them almost with a certainty to have been their descendants or near relations. Olaf Cwaran, being expelled from Northumberland for the last time, seems to have had his chief residence for some years either in Man or in the Isles, while from time to time he made expeditions to Ireland, waiting for an opportunity to regain some of his former possessions there. In this, at least, he succeeded, being mentioned by the Ulster annals in the year of 969 as lord of Dublin, after which time he continued in the possession of it, till—having sustained a terrible defeat by the supreme King of Ireland, Melachlin (Malsechnail),[a] and been compelled to deliver all his captives and hostages, as well as to resign the yearly tribute which he had hitherto levied from the Nial tribe, and to pay a great contribution of cattle and money—he felt so depressed that he resolved to go to Iona on a pilgrimage, there to do penance for his sins. Perhaps even he abdicated before he went away, meaning to pass the remainder of his life among the holy men ; he died, however, in the same year as he came there, A.D. 980. This resolution of his, after all, shows that there must also have been a connexion of some kind between him and the Isles. About this time there appears in the ancient annals, as Lord of the Isles, a king or chieftain, designed by the odd name of *Maccus, son of Harold*, which, indeed, seems to be nothing more than a misconstruction of the Irish "*Mac Arailt*," *i.e.*, "the son of Harold," his real name being consequently

taken his statement from English chronicles, and that the descendence assigned to Eric rests only upon his own conjecture.

[a] [This was the famous battle of Tara, gained over Olave Cwaran by Maelsechlainn or Malachy II., A.D. 980, who afterwards, but in the same year, became King of Ireland.]

unknown.[a] This "Mac Harold" conquered Anglesea, from which conquest, however, he was driven shortly afterwards. In the year 973, he is named among the eight kings, from the whole island of Britain, who then made their homage to King Eadgar at Chester, and rowed his barge to and from church. In the next year he occupied the fair island of Inniscathaig, situated in the mouth of the Shannon, where he robbed the tomb of St. Senan, and delivered from captivity the Norwegian King of Limerick, named Ivar. On this expedition, it is said the "Lagmanns" of the Isles went along with him.[b]

Now the word "Lagman" (*lögmaðr lagmaðr* As. *lahmon*) literally signifies "a man of the law," and afterwards in Norway, as in Sweden, was the title of the chief judges. Here, however, it is used as the peculiar title of some of the chieftains; and perhaps we may conclude from this that these chieftains were invested with a special judiciary power. It is worth while here to remark that afterwards, in the very family of the Insular kings, and most probably of this "Mac Harold" himself, the name *Lagman* (*Lögmaðr*) was used as a noun proper, being the name of one king at least, as we shall see further on.[c] This may, perhaps, be explained thus, that the natives of the Isles, hearing the title of "lawman" bestowed upon a chieftain, fancied it to be his real name, and adopted it as such themselves, whence again it found its way as such back to the Norwegian conquerors, who intermarried with the native families, and, as usual in Norway, often happened to give to

[a] He is called "Maccus" . . "*plurimarum rex insularum*," by Florence of Worcester, *Monum. Hist. Brit.* i. p. 578. In "*Brut y Tywysogion*" (ib. p. 849), his name is *Marc uab Herald*. The "*Annales Cambriæ*" have only "*filius Haraldi*," even so the *Annals of Inisfallen* calling him "*Mac Araill*," O'Connor, *Res. Hib. Scr.* i. p. 44, 46. The *Annals of the Four Masters* give his name, evidently wrongly, "*Maccnus Mac Arailt;*" the name "Magnus," however, did not exist among the Northmen at that time. In an Anglos. diploma of the year 971, appearing, however, not to be genuine, he calls himself "*Mascusius archipirata.*" [Ling. calls him Mac Orric of Anglesey and the Isles, i. 270. Robertson says that Magnus Haroldson was King of Man and the Islands, a great grandson of the Limerick branch of Ivar. His father Aralt was son of the elder Sitric, son of Ivar, and was killed in Connaught in 940, i. 75, n. Todd, 271, n. 4, 272, n. 5.]

[b] *Annals of the Four Masters.*

[c] [The Lagmans are spoken of as a tribe of the Norsemen from the Insi Gall, or Western Islands of Scotland. In 962 they came with the fleet of Olave, or Olave's son, and plundered the coast of Louth, Howth, and Ireland's Eye. "The fleet of Lagmann" is mentioned amongst many others as coming to Erinn.—Todd, xxxvi. 41. Robertson (ii. 18, 102), speaks of the Lamond family as clan Lagman, which name, he says, points to a Scoto-Norwegian origin; their Gaelic name was Mac Erchar.]

one of their sons the name of his maternal grandfather. There is another instance of the same thing, throwing a very interesting light upon this matter. It is well known that the Norwegian name *Sumarliði* was (and is perhaps still, as corrupted into "Somerled") very frequent among the inhabitants of the Western Isles and shores of Scotland, while in some of the Irish annals we find the Norwegian Vikings, or a peculiar kind of them, called *Sumarlidi* (the Somerleds), as if this were a noun appellative, which is rather adequate in itself, for "*Sumarliði*," composed of *Sumar*, *i.e.*, summer, and *liði*, a person who wanders about (from the verb *liða* to wander, As. *lidan*), signifies "Summer-Wanderer," a very proper name for a pirate, who went out on his expeditions every summer, spending the winter at home, or in a friendly port. The Norwegians had also, and have yet, another name parallel to "*Sumarliði*," viz. *Vetrliði*, the first part of which is the word *vetr*, *i.e.*, Winter; literally translated, it means "Winter-Wanderer," and is used as a noun appellative to design a bear who has gone to take his winter-sleep. It seems very likely that also *Sumarliði* originally has been used in the same manner, to designate the bear, roving about in the summer; and that the skalds or poets have since applied both as proper designations for the Vikings, either wandering about for prey in the summer, or taking to their snug hearths in the winter; but that, as it happened so often in Norway and Iceland, the general denomination became a surname for certain persons, and this surname again in succeeding generations the real and only name of descendants called after them.[a]

From this digression, which may not be superfluous for the better understanding of what follows, we return to the "Mac Harold" above mentioned. For three successive years he maintained himself at Inniscathaig, till, in the year 976, he was attacked and killed, along with his two sons, by the celebrated *Brian Boroimhe*, whose name now begins to appear in the Irish annals. Ivar of Limerick, who showed his gratitude to "Mac Harold" by assisting him, although in vain, was defeated and put to flight.[b]

[a] In this way we find the great grandson of the powerful Icelandic chieftain Thord Gellir, called only "Gellir," although this was only the nickname of his father, who got it on account of his stentorian voice (*Gellir*, *i.e.*, the bellowing). Even so Skafte, the "Lögsögumaðr" of Iceland, about 1003, was called after his grandmother's father, whose proper name was Thormod, but who had got the surname of *Skafte*.

[b] [From Todd it appears that Aralt or Harold, King of the Munster Danes, who was slain by Brian in 978, at the battle of Cathair Cuan, after a prodigious slaughter of the foreigners, was *son of Ivar* of Limerick, who was grandson of Ivar; whereas the Aralt, previously mentioned, was *son of Sitric*, and was himself

As King of Man and the Isles there appears now a *Godred (Goðröðr), son of Harold;* which patronymical designation makes it very probable that he was a brother of the former "Mac Harold." Seeing that the names of Harold and Godred occur very frequently in the royal line of Limerick, and that Ivar of Limerick was so closely connected with "Mac Harold," we think it very likely that the royal line of Man was a branch of the same.[a] Godred is frequently mentioned in the sagas, as well as in the Irish and British annals.[b] In 979 he supported the Welsh Prince Constantine the Black against his cousin Howel, but was twice defeated with considerable loss; the third time, however, he came in the opportune hour, when Meredith, the son of Owen, had obtained the dominion after great struggles. Profiting by the state of exhaustion in which Meredith found himself, he attacked Anglesey, slaughtered 2000 men, captured the brother of Meredith, and had his eyes put out. The terrified Meredith fled to Cardigan, leaving Godred, it would seem in the possession of Anglesey.

His success, however, was not of long duration, a more powerful star having risen on the western horizon. This was *Sigurd* (Siward), Earl of Orkney and Caithness, son of Earl *Hlöðver* (Lewis), by an Irish princess,[c] and great grandson of the famous Turf-Einar, the third earl and founder of the dynasty. Sigurd, having succeeded to the earldom in 980, at his father's demise, aspired, as it seems, to nothing less than the subjugation of all islands, coasts, or lands in the West, where the Norwegians had made settlements. Selecting his warriors from different

grandson of Ivar—271, n. 4, 275, n. 4. Amongst the exactions of this family is noticed a nose tax, in addition to the royal tribute, consisting of an ounce of silver or white bronze, "for every nose," *i.e.*, for every man, and whoever was unable to pay was sold as a slave.—*Id.* ciii.]

[a] [In Todd's genealogical tables, A: the sons of Ivar (Limerick branch), Magnus, King of Man, who died about 977, and Godfrey, slain in 989, were the sons of Sitric, Lord of Limerick, who was slain in Connaught, in 896, by his own countrymen.]

[b] [Godfrey Haroldson is called King of the Insi Gall, or Western Islands of the foreigners. Todd applies to Man what Munch applies to Anglesey, for he cites the *Ann. Ult.* as recording a great battle at the Isle of *Man* in 986 by the son of Harold (Mac Arailt), and the Danes, in which 1000 were slain; and the *Ann. Camb.*, at 978, as recording the devastation of Man (Mon) by Godred (Gothrit) with the black Gentiles, and the capture of 2000 men; and the *Brut of Tywys*, A.D. 970 and 986 (for there are two entries of the same event), where Man is called Mon or Mona.—Todd, 272, n. 6.]

[c] [Todd calls his mother *Edna*, which he supposes to be the Irish *Eithne*, she was daughter of Cearbhall or Carrol, son of Dungal, lord of Ossory and King of Dublin, p. 302, n. 13, clxxxv. Robertson calls her *Auda*, and says she was the daughter of an Irish king, Kerval, i. 84.]

parts of the North, he made every year attacks upon Scotland, the Sudreys, and Ireland, and succeeded not only in keeping Caithness, which the Maormor of Moray, Finnlaich (the father of the famous Macbeth) strove in vain to take, but ultimately in conquering and possessing for a time Sutherland, Ross, Moray, and Argyll.[a]

The Isles, or Sudreys proper, which, shortly before his accession, are stated to have paid tribute direct to Norway,[b] came very soon under his sway, and were governed by a tributary earl called *Gilli*[c] in the sagas, who resided in Colonsay,[d] and in 989 married his sister. In 982 Sigurd made a successful attack upon the Isle of Man, and extorted from the inhabitants a heavy ransom to be paid in pure silver; of which, however, only a small part came into his hands, because the collectors having suffered shipwreck on an uninhabited island near the Irish coast, could not get away otherwise, than by purchasing from an Icelandic merchant, coming from Dublin, the boat of his ship, for the greater

[a] [Finlay Mac Rory "marked out a battle-field for Jarl Sigurd on Skida Moor." The jarl bore a mystic banner of a flying raven, the work of his Irish mother, which gave victory to those who followed it, but was fatal to him who bore it.—Robertson, i. 94.]

[b] In the Flôamanna Saga, which appears to be very trustworthy, it is told, that about the year 980 Earl Hácon sent Thorgils, a high-born Icelander who had entered his service, to the Sudreys, with the commission to exact and collect the tribute "which had been withheld for three successive years." Thorgils and his friend, a Norwegian named Thorstein, went away with two ships, but not many people; having reached the Isles, they demanded the tribute, but got only very little of it; on their return they were shipwrecked on the coast of Caithness, and lost all their goods; yet they were hospitably received by an earl, named Olaf, who commanded in these parts, and Thorgils had the opportunity of serving the earl a good turn, by killing in "holmgang," or judiciary combat, a redoubted pirate, who insolently demanded the earl's sister in marriage. Thorgils, who according to the "holmgang law," inherited the ships and chattels of the pirate, was rewarded with the hand of the fair damsel, and the earl's assistance; the next year, therefore, he was able to appear at the Sudreys with greater force, and compel the inhabitants to pay the amount.

[c] This is evidently only the first half of the earl's real name. We learn from the Norwegian history, that the King Harold Gilli, who was born and bred up in Ireland, did originally bear the name of Gilchrist, Gillachrist, which afterwards in Norway was shortened into *Gilli;* in the same manner, the above named earl may have in reality been called Gillecolum, Gillepatrick, Gillechrist, or by another of these names, being compositions of "Giolla" (a servant) and some saint's name. [Robertson says that Gille, Jarl of the Sudreys, was either the nephew or the brother-in-law of Jarl Sigurd, or both, as a marriage between an aunt and her nephew occasionally took place in the distant north, i. 162, note.]

[d] In the Njála it is called "Koln," and has been believed by others to be *Coll;* it seems however evident that "Kolns-ey" must be "Colonsay."

part of the collected silver.[a] That Godred the son of Harold, who pretended to be King of Man and all the Isles, would necessarily sooner or later come into conflict with Sigurd or his vassals, is not surprising. In the year 987, after having fought a successful, but very bloody battle with a fleet of Danish pirates, who had attacked Iona on Christmas night, and killed the Abbot with fifteen monks,[b] he was himself, in his turn, attacked and vanquished by a little fleet under the command of Earl Sigurd's men. In 989 he was again vanquished by the same warriors, and lost his son Donald in the battle.[c] Shortly afterwards, before the end of the year, he was killed by the Dalriadic Scots, according to the Irish annals.[d]

For a long time afterwards Earl Sigurd seems to have been in undisputed possession of the Sudreys, yet, as it is distinctly stated, tributary to the powerful ruler of Norway, Earl Hácon, as long almost as this prince lived. Beyond the annual tribute, however, no other sign or service of vassalage seems to have been enforced, and Sigurd ruled in fact as an independent and powerful monarch. He strengthened himself greatly by marrying a daughter of the Scottish King Malcolm (of the Moray dynasty, nephew of Finnlaich).[e] A little before the death of Earl Hácon, he was unlucky enough to fall in with King Olaf Tryggvason, in the bay of Ronaldsvoe, when on his way from Dublin to get the Norwegian crown, who now availed himself of the opportunity—Sigurd being the weaker part—to take the earl prisoner, and restored him to liberty only on condition that he swore him fealty as his liege subject, and embraced Christianity with all his men.[f] Olaf, however, did not reign for more than five years; after his fall in the battle of Swalder, A.D. 1000, Norway was divided among the victors, the Kings of Sweden and Denmark, and Earl Eric, son of Earl Hácon, and as there is no mention to be found of Sigurd's having acknowledged the superiority of any of these princes, it is very likely that during this

[a] Eyrbyggjasaga, c. 29. Thorodd, the Icelander, was henceforth called "Thorodd Skattkaupandi" (the purchaser of the tribute).

[b] *Annals of Ulster.* [c] Njálssaga, c. 87.

[d] *Tighernac*, by O'Connor, v. ii. p. 267.—*Ulster Annals*, ib. iv. p. 286.

[e] [Malcolm II. gave his daughter in marriage to Sigurd, soon after his victory over the Maormor Finlay, the father of Macbeth, in order to secure the alliance of the Orkney jarl, as a formidable rival to the hostile family of Moray.—Robertson, i. 111.]

[f] [His allegiance to Norway sat lightly on the jarl, and ceased with the life of his son Hundi, who had been carried off as a hostage by Olave a few years afterwards; but as no mention is ever made of a relapse into Paganism, the conversion of the Orkneys dates from this summary proceeding.—Robertson, i. 86. Ling. i. 281. Dunham, i. 216; ii. 7, 8.]

interregnum he ruled as an independent sovereign; his brother in law, the Earl of the Sudreys, continuing on the best terms with him, and consequently doubtless paying him tribute every year. The interregnum ended by the accession of Olaf, the son of Harold, afterwards St. Olaf, to the Norwegian crown in 1015; but shortly before that time Earl Sigurd fell in the great battle of Clontarf, near Dublin (on the 23d of April, 1014), against Brian Boroimhe.[a] He left four sons, three begotten before his marriage with the Scottish princess, now full-grown men; the fourth, Thorfinn, grandson of the Scottish king, still a child. Those three divided Orkney and Shetland between themselves; but no mention is made, on this occasion, of the Sudreys. It may be that Earl Gille continued in his allegiance even to the sons of Sigurd; it may also be probable that King Cnut, who claimed for himself the right to the Norwegian crown, even tried to enforce the obedience of the Sudreys. It is told in a very old abridgment of the Norwegian history, written about 1180, only 166 years after the death of Earl Sigurd, that when King Olaf, on his arrival in Norway, captured Earl Hácon, son of Eric, nephew of King Cnut, he made him swear that he would never return to Norway, and gave him the Sudreys, and assisted him to establish his power there.[b] The last is not true, as far as regards Olaf; but it is not unlikely that King Cnut may have helped Earl Hácon to get possession of the Isles, especially as it is certain that Earl Hácon, when he made his last fatal voyage to Norway in the winter 1029-30, went down and was drowned in the Pentland firth, which seems to imply, that he did not come from the eastern parts of England, but from the west.

Be this, however, as it may, there can be no doubt, that *Thorfinn*, Earl Sigurd's fourth son, who, like his father, became one of the most powerful princes in those parts, extended his rule also to the Sudreys. The Orkneyinga saga says so expressly. Outliving his elder brothers, he became the Lord of Orkney and Shetland; Caithness was given him by his maternal grandfather, King Malcolm Mac Malbrigid, and after

[a] It is therefore called the "Brians-battle" in the sagas. [Sigurd was nicknamed Digri, or the Fat. He is described as performing prodigies at the battle of Clontarf, his fury being that of a robber upon a plain, no pointed or edged weapon being able to touch him. He fell under the sword of Murchadh, the son of Brian, having taken his charmed banner from the staff, for two of his followers having fallen with the banner, they bade him carry his own devil himself; and so, when it was removed from the staff, and hide under his cloak, the charm was broken.—Todd, *passim.*]

[b] *Agrip*, cap. 20. Fornmanna Sögur, x. p. 396.

the death of Malcolm in 1029,[a] he sustained a successful war with King Malcolm Mac Kenneth, of the southern dynasty, conquered Sutherland and Ross, and made himself lord of Galloway,[b] in the widest sense of this denomination, viz. from Solway to Carrick, where he resided for long periods, and whence he made successful inroads, sometimes on Cumberland, the English possession of Duncan, King Malcolm's grand-

[a] We take it as granted that the reader is aware of the mistake so common among the historians of Scotland, to confound the two Malcolms here mentioned, and to make one of them, as if one Malcolm only (Malcolm II.) reigned from 1004 till 1034. The very trustworthy Tighernach states expressly that "King Malcolm Mac Malbrigid Mac Ruairi" died in 1029, and "King Malcolm Mac Kenneth" in 1034. They were both heads of the two rival dynasties, who claimed the crown of Scotland, and the representatives of whom for a long period reigned almost alternately; the Croeb or Moray dynasty, and that of Mac Alpin. Even in the Orkney. Saga the death of Malcolm, the grandfather of Thorfinn, is said to have taken place between incidents, one of which belongs to A.D. 1028, the other to A.D. 1030. [Robertson says that Malcolm II. reigned from A.D. 1005-34, when he was assassinated at Glammis, in the same province of Angus, which forty years before had proved so fatal to his father. Thorfinn, when a mere child, had been placed by him over Sutherland and Caithness: In 1030, on the death of his half brother, Brusi, he annexed the Orkneys to his dominions. He is described as "stout and strong, but very ugly; severe, and cruel, but a very clever man." Duncan I., who reigned from A.D. 1034-1040, attempted to deprive him of his earldom, but was himself defeated, and his defeat was followed by his assassination in the "smith's bothy," near Elgin, at the hands of Macbeth, who succeeded him, and reigned from 1040-58. Thorfinn is said to have held a large Riki in Ireland, and to have extended his kingdom from Thurso Skerry to Dublin, and to have exacted tribute and assumed the prerogatives of the earlier kings of Dublin. He died about 1064. His sons were at the battle of Stamford Bridge in 1066, and escaping from the slaughter, led a peaceful and inglorious existence as joint jarls in their northern home. Ingebiorge, the widow of Thorfinn, married Malcolm III., who reigned from 1058-93.—Robertson, i. 98, 127, and 161-2.]

[b] Orkneyinga Saga, p. 54. It is here said that "Earl Thorfinn resided for long periods at Caithness, in the place called *Gaddgeðlar*, where England and Scotland touch each other." Considering the situation of Caithness, and how well the author of the Saga must have known it, it becomes evident that between "Caithness" and "in the place," an *and* must have been dropped by the subsequent writer, who, living about 1380, and in Iceland (this part of the Saga existing only in the *Codex Flateyensis*), might easily have dropped an "*ok*" (or the abbreviation thereof), not conscious of the great blunder he committed. "Gaddgedlar" is evidently the Norwegian corruption of "Galwydia," "Galwayth," or a Gaelic form maybe still nearer to it. From a verse, composed by the Icelander Arnor, the court-poet of Thorfinn, we learn that he once made an inroad upon the coast "south of Man" (*i.e.*, east of Man, Ireland being then regarded as situated north of Man), to carry away some cattle (Orkney. Saga, p. 58); this expedition to Cumberland cannot have been made from Caithness, but readily from the opposite Galloway shore.

son and future successor, sometimes upon Ireland, of which he is said to have conquered a part. As lord of Galloway, it was very convenient for Thorfinn to make, as it is stated, frequent expeditions to Ireland and the Sudreys, and he might easily maintain his superiority over at least a part of the latter. It cannot but have contributed greatly to the power of Thorfinn that in 1040 the famous Macbeth, son of Finnlaich, established himself on the Scottish throne, having killed the above mentioned Duncan in a battle ;[a] we might even take it for granted that Thorfinn lent his aid to his kinsman Macbeth, and was subsequently rewarded with new extensive possessions ; indeed, Thorfinn, according to the Orkneyinga Saga, possessed, besides the Sudreys and part of Ireland, not less than nine earldoms in Scotland (most likely Caithness, Sutherland, Ross, Moray, Buchan, Atholl, Lorn, Argyll, Galloway), and it has been all but proved by a modern author, who combines a rare extent of knowledge with no less sagacity, that what is called the dominion of Macbeth in Scotland was in reality the sway or influence exercised by Earl Thorfinn and the Norwegians of Orkney.[b]

Afterwards, when Malcolm Ceanmor, the son of Duncan, aided by his relation, Earl Sigurd of Northumberland,[c] vanquished Macbeth (1054), and drove him back towards the north, where at last he was killed in the battle of Lumphanan (1057),[d]—Thorfinn likewise seems to have met with no inconsiderable reverses, nay, there is even good reason to believe that he took part in the battle of 1054[e] (which was fought somewhere in Lothian or Fife), and lost there a son, named Dolgfinn.[f]

[a] [Did he not basely murder him ? see addition to note on the preceding page ; also Ling. i. 345.]

[b] Skene, *The Highlanders in Scotland*, i. p. 113-116. [John Hill Burton referring to this passage, says : "In this revolution it is known that the Norse power in Scotland had great influence, though we cannot get at its sources and character with complete exactness."—*Hist. Scot.* i. 374.]

[c] [Ling. calls him Siward ; he was uncle to the youthful Malcolm, i. 345.]

[d] We continue here to follow the Irish annals compared with *Chron. Saxon.*, Fordun being utterly confused, telling us that Malcolm and Sigurd both together vanquished and killed Macbeth at Lumphanan in December 1056, while it is known that Sigurd was dead already in 1055, and that the battle of Lumphanan was not fought till August or September 1057. The battle in which Sigurd, no doubt together with Malcolm, vanquished (but not killed) Macbeth, was that of 1054 (27th of July), it is not said where, only it must have been south of Dundee.

[e] [On the 27th of July 1054, Siward, Earl of Northumberland, attacked Macbeth with the whole force of his province. Fifteen hundred of the Anglo-Danes fell in the contest, with the son and nephew of the earl, but Siward gained the day, slew three thousand of the enemy, and carried off a booty unprecedented in the annals of Border warfare.—Robertson, i. 122.]

[f] The *Ulster Annals* say that in this battle of 1054 fell 1500 Saxons (Eng-

Seeing that Malcolm, no doubt by means of continual aid from England, was enabled even to crush Macbeth's successor Lulach of Moray, likewise a relation of Thorfinn, and (1058) to establish himself firmly on the throne, we may infer that Thorfinn shared the fate of his relatives, and was compelled to yield at least his possessions in the south of Scotland. But how far he lost also the Sudreys, or his part thereof, it is impossible to say with anything like certainty. We learn from the Irish annals, compared with the Welsh and Cornish ones, that in the year 1058 King Harold of Norway sent a fleet under the command of his son Magnus, with men from the Orkneys, Sudreys, and Dublin, to attack the western part of England, but without success.[a] From this it would appear too, that Thorfinn, feeling himself too weak to oppose the united force of Malcolm and the English, applied to his lord paramount, King Harold, for aid; and it would appear that then, at least, the Sudreys formed still a part of Thorfinn's dominions. The Norwegian prince Magnus, a near relation to Thorfinn's wife Ingebjörg, being then only a child, and consequently not fit to command in person, it is to be supposed that he was sent partly because of this very relationship. partly in order to be proclaimed king in the countries which were to be conquered. Although this expedition was not successful, as far as regards England, we must, however, suppose that the Norwegian superiority was maintained at least in the Isles. The strife between Thorfinn and Malcolm no doubt continued till the death of the former (1064), when his widow Ingebjörg, the mother of his two young sons

lishmen), and "Dolfin son of Finntor." "Finntor" seems to be merely a transposition of "Thorfinn;" Dolfinn, or more properly *Dolgfinn*, was a name usual in the Orkneys; there was afterwards an Orkneyan bishop of that name.

[a] Tighernach says: (1058) a fleet came under the guidance of the son of the King of Lochlan with the Galls of Orkney, Sudrey (*Innsi Gall*), and Dublin, to conquer the kingdom of the Saxons (England), but God willed otherwise. Brut and Tywysogion: that Magnus, son of Harold, came to England, and devastated it along with Griffith, King of Wales. Chron. Saxon.: Earl Ælfgár was expelled, but came soon back, aided by Griffith; there came even a fleet from Norway. Florence of Worcester says expressly that the Norwegians aided Ælfgár and Griffith. [On the death of Earl Godwin his earldom was given to Harold; that of Harold to Alfgar, the son of Leofric, a rival family. Alfgar was accused of treason and outlawed. He fled to Ireland, purchased the assistance of a northern sea king, was joined by Griffith, Prince of Wales, and poured his Welsh and Norwegian auxiliaries into the county of Hereford. The city was taken and pillaged, the cathedral and principal buildings were burned, and 400 of the inhabitants were slain, A.D. 1057. Peace was made and broken, and made again; and eventually Griffith's head was sent as a peace-offering to Harold who had pursued the Welsh into the fastnesses of Snowdon, A.D. 1063.—Ling. i. 346-348.]

and successors *Paul* and *Erlend*, married Malcolm, which evidently indicates that a peace must have been concluded.[a] That the young earls continued to keep the Sudreys, seems therefore most likely; this, at least, is the most natural way to account for the appearance of Godred Crowan, as we learn hereafter, in the Norwegian army at Stanfordbridge.

NOTE 3, p. 50.—*Haraldus Harphagre—Harfager.*

This is the powerful King Harold just mentioned, who appears under the erroneous surname of "Harfager" in all English chronicles, where he is mentioned, even as early as in the almost contemporary entries in *Chronicum Saxonicum*. The surname of "*hárfagri*" (fair-haired) did not belong to him, but to his ancestor, Harold founder of the Norwegian kingdom (853-933) who got the name on account of his beautiful yellow hair. The younger Harold, however, the one here mentioned, was called "*harðraði*," the hard ruler, because he ruled with a strong hand. The Angles, misled by the similarity of the sound, confounded both appellations. Of Harold's expedition to England, and

[a] It is generally said by the Scotch historians, upon the authority of Fordun, that Duncan, the son of Malcolm by Ingebjörg, was a bastard, which infers that there was no regular marriage between his father and mother. However, as the Orkney. Saga and many others state expressly that Ingebjörg married Malcolm, and as it is not in the least probable that she, belonging to one of the highest families in Norway, being herself the daughter of an earl, the widow of an earl, and the mother of two reigning earls, should have debased herself so as to become the mistress of anybody, even of a king, the statement of Fordun must be entirely erroneous, and rest perhaps upon the sole fact that the marriage between Malcolm and Ingebjörg, as all marriages among the Norwegians in those times, was no doubt only a civil one, contracted without any ecclesiastical formalities, but therefore not the less valid, while that which he subsequently celebrated with Margaret of England, was perhaps confirmed by the benediction of the Church. After the death of Malcolm we see also Duncan claim the crown before Eadgár, the son of Malcolm by Margaret. As the marriage of Malcolm with Margaret took place in 1067, it must be supposed that Ingebjörg was dead before that time, perhaps in childbed with Duncan. [Robertson places the death of Thorfinn, Ingebiorge's first husband, ten years earlier than it is placed by Chalmers, and contends that there is no reason to doubt the legitimacy of Duncan.—i. 127, n. We suppose Professor Munch by *civil* marriage means *clandestine*; as civil marriages, in the modern sense of the word, were not known at the period. The clandestine marriages, that is such as were contracted by the parties without the prescribed formalities, though reprobated, were held to be valid by the Church, till the Council of Trent made the mere private contract invalid. It is not likely that all Norwegian marriages were clandestine, or the usage would have been mentioned amongst the abuses complained of in the Episcopal and Pontifical documents of the time.].

the battle of Stanfordbridge (September 25, 1066), little needs to be said here, the particulars being sufficiently known from English chronicles, as well as from Norwegian sagas. Among the vassals of Harold, who were obliged to furnish him with auxiliary troops, and even to participate in the combat, were the above mentioned young Earls of Orkney, Paul and Erlend.[a]

NOTE 4, p. 50.—*Godredus cognomento Crouan filius Haraldi nigri de Ysland.*

Godred, the founder of the royal dynasty of Man,[b] appears here abruptly, nothing further being said of his ancestors or of his origin than that he was the son of Harold the Black "of Ysland." There can, however, be very little doubt that in aspiring subsequently to the crown of Man, and really making himself king of the Island, with its appendages, he vindicated only what he regarded as his hereditary right. If he had not belonged to a royal line, or if his ancestors had not enjoyed the title of king, it would have been almost impossible, according to the feelings or opinions of those days, that he should have ventured to assume it. The title of king, among the northern, nay, generally among the German tribes, was in itself strictly hereditary; it did not even cling to, or rest upon the possession of lands, but was a mere personal distinction; the word in itself, *kon-ungr*, As. *cyn-ing*, designates only "a man of family" (*kon* or *kyn*, As. *cyn*, Got. *kuni*). Therefore even the powerful Earl Hácon, who ruled over the greater part of Norway, and had sixteen earls under himself, did never presume to decorate himself with the royal title; he belonged to an "Earl's-line," not to a "King's-line," and must accordingly acquiesce in the title of earl. Taking it, consequently, for granted, that Godred descended from a royal family, and that his ancestors were kings, we think it very probable, nay, almost certain, that his grandfather was no other than the above mentioned[c] Godred, son of Harold, who was killed in 989. In those times it was a rule, pretty generally observed among the north-

[a] [September 25 or 27 are given by English writers as the date of the battle of Stanford Bridge, the most bloody recorded in our annals: at the distance of fifty years the spot was still whitened with the bones of the slain. Harold Hardrada, King of Norway, embarked with a gallant army and a fleet of 300 sail, and was joined by Tostig, the exiled Earl of Northumberland, at the mouth of the Tyne. Both lost their lives in the battle, but the diversion they made was favourable to William of Normandy, who landed in England on the 29th of September. The battle of Hastings, in which fell Harold, Godwin's son, the conqueror at Stanfordbridge, was fought October 14, 1066.—Ling. i. 362-375.]

[b] [See Appendix, No. 55.]

[c] [See page 135.]

ern tribes, as it is still in many parts of Norway, that the grandson got the name of the grandfather, and this well-known fact affords very often a great clue to the determination of genealogies. Now, Godred being son of Harold, and having himself a son called Harold, was likewise no doubt a grandson of another Godred, son of Harold ; and the time in which this supposed grandfather must have lived coincides entirely with that just indicated,[a] so that there can be little doubt of their identity. Godred the elder had accordingly, as we believe, two sons,—Donald, who was killed in 989, and, having a Gaelic name which was not usual in the family, seems to have been a bastard, born before his father's marriage ; and Harold, the father of Godred Crowan, no doubt born in wedlock, and heir to his title and estates, but younger.[b] Harold, the father of Godred Crowan, is called "Haraldus niger *de Ysland*" in the chronicle.

This name *Ysland*, has been construed by some interpreters as being a blunder for "Ireland," which, however, is not very probable, Ireland being throughout the whole book always styled *Yhernia*. We will not utterly deny the possibility of perhaps *Iceland* being meant, as it would in itself be not at all unlikely that Harold the Black, after his father's death, might have retired to Iceland, as so many other Norwegian warriors from those parts did, and that his son Godred, watching every opportunity for regaining the lands of his ancestors, stepped forth to follow King Harold on his expedition. However, seeing that the epithet "de Ysland" stands here evidently as a territorial designation, but not as a mere indication of the country from whence Harold or Godred came, we are rather inclined to think that it means neither Ireland nor Iceland, but the island of *Isla*, which in other places of the book is called *Yle*, but might for once, through a blunder or inconsequence of the writer, have been called "Ysland."[c] It is not to be overlooked that Godred died in the island of Isla, which may seem to involve that he generally resided there, and that it was his paternal domain. If this be right, he appeared then, perhaps, among the followers of Harold as a vassal either of the king himself or of the Orkneyan Earls.

Godred the son of Sytric (*i.e.*, Sigtryggr), who reigned in Man, when

[a] As Godred himself lived in the times of Edward the Confessor, and William the Conqueror, his father must have been the contemporary of Cnut, and his grandfather of Æðelréd and Edward the martyr.

[b] [This genealogy does not agree with that given by Dr. Todd, p. 271.]

[c] [Robertson calls Godred Crovan or "the White Hand," son of Harold the Black of Iceland, i. 163.]

Godred Crowan came there, seems, to judge from his patronymic name, to have belonged to the dynasty of Dublinian kings; perhaps even he was himself King of Dublin. The Irish annals say, that when Diarmid, King of Leinster (A.D. 1052), had vanquished and put to flight the King of Dublin, Eachmargath (in the sagas called Margaðr), son of Ragnvald (Reginald), he was for some time Lord of Dublin, together with his son Murchad, who made the Island of Man tributary (A.D. 1060), having defeated "Mac Reginald" (the son of Ragnvald).[a] After the fall of Diarmid, however, in 1072, we find on the royal throne of Dublin one Godred, "grandson of Ragnvald," who died in 1075, and after him another Godred, called "Mananagh" (he of Man), who ruled till 1094, and died in 1095, being, as we shall see, no other person than Godred Crowan.[b] Now it seems scarcely to admit of any doubt that the first mentioned Godred, grandson of Ragnvald, was no other person than the Godred, son of Sytric, in our Chronicle, and that, consequently, the anonymous "Son of Ragnvald," who was defeated by Murchad in 1060, was Sytric or Sigtrygg, the father of Godred.

It must be supposed that Godred, having hereditary right to Dublin, returned thither immediately after the fall of Diarmid the usurper. To be sure, the Chronicle of Man assigns to the death of Godred the year 1051, which, as the battle of Stanfordbridge is said to have taken place in 1047, ought to signify 1070. Yet we have already had instances enough to prove that the years of Christ given in the earlier part of the Chronicle are generally erroneous, and must be corrected by comparison with other statements. Now, as Godred Crowan (as will be seen hereafter) died in 1095, and our Chronicle states expressly that he reigned over Man for sixteen years from the time of the conquest, this event must have taken place in 1079 or 1080, not, as our Chronicle has it, in 1074 or 1075 (signified by 1056). Here, therefore, is a miscalculation of four (or rather twenty-three), or five (twenty-four) years, and this difference, added to 1070 (1051), in which our Chronicle places the death of Godred, make exactly 1074 or 1075.[c] Moreover,

[a] *Annals of the Four Masters.* [Eachmargath, driven from Dublin by Diarmid, was the son of Ragnald, who was the son of Olave Cuaran, or Olave of the Sandal. He had succeeded his uncle Sitric at Dublin, when in 1035 he went beyond the sea, probably into religious retirement. Ragnald the father of Eachmargath was amongst the slain at Tara. Todd 290-1.]

[b] *Tighernach*, and *Annals of Ulster.*

[c] [The death of Godred is placed by the Chronicle in 1051, and the conquest of Man in 1056; but to each of those dates nineteen years must be added, so that these years become what Munch has made them in the text, 1070 and 1075. See note 1, p. 123.]

there still exists a letter, written in A.D. 1074, by Godred, "Rex Hiberniæ" to Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury, requesting the consecration of Gillepatrick, elected bishop of Dublin after the demise of Duncan,[a] and as this Godred cannot possibly be Godred Crowan, it must have been Godred the son of Sigtrygg, who, accordingly, was still living in 1074.

In the Chronicles of Ulster there is subsequently an entry for the year 1087, purporting "that the grandsons of Ragnvald," accompanied by the son of the King of Ulster, went to Man with a fleet, but were killed. These must have been the brothers of Godred, and perhaps even his son, the exiled Fingall, of whom no more is said in our Chronicle, although there is no mention made of his being killed when Godred Crowan conquered the island. Very likely, therefore, he retired to Ireland, his proper home, from whence he afterwards made the unsuccessful expedition just mentioned.

All these facts, however, seem sufficiently to prove that during the interval between the death of Godred the son of Harold, in 989, and the accession of Godred Crowan, in 1079, or 1080, the Island of Man must have been an appendage of the Norwegian kingdom of Dublin, whereas it would appear that the Isles chiefly belonged to the Earls of Orkney.

As to the tale of the manner in which Godred Crowan conquered Man, and became the real owner of the soil, it seems very likely that this is a kind of anachronism, and that tradition, not supported by authentic records, has assigned to the Godred of 1080, what, if after all it was a real fact, belonged to another Godred of much earlier times, the hero of popular legends, who was identified with the Godred of later days, because the historical traditions in the island itself did not reach farther backward. A legendary character pervades the whole narrative. What especially seems to remind us of an age much earlier than 1080, is the account of Godred's having acquired the personal property of the soil, excluding the hereditary rights of the inhabitants.[b]

[a] *Baronii Annales*, t. xi. p. 641. Here also the answer of Lanfranc to Godred is inserted, showing that Godred at this time was the reigning King of Dublin. Lanfranc gives him the title of "Rex Hiberniæ." [See the letters of Gregory VII. and of Lanfranc, in Appendix, Nos. 1 and 2. The first may perhaps explain also why the archbishop elect of Dublin was sent for consecration to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The letter of Gregory VII. to Lanfranc is given in Baronius, under A.D. 1073, that of Lanfranc to Godred under A.D. 1089; this is owing to some letters of Lanfranc, not before alluded to by Baronius, being added in the year to which Baronius attributes his death. No letter of Godred to Lanfranc is given by Baronius, but the letter of Lanfranc makes the probability of such a letter having been written very great.]

[b] [Robertson, commenting on this acquisition of Godred, says that the abroga-

The same tale almost is told of the conqueror of Norway, Harold Hárfagri, who is said to have appropriated to himself all udal (óðal, hereditary lands), so that henceforth the possessors of lands did not retain them in their own right, but had them only in farm or fief from the king. Something like it is even told of the conqueror-Kings of Denmark in the 9th century, and of Einar, Earl of Orkney, who lived at the same time; indeed, there can be no doubt that the same or similar legends, only with local variations, existed all over the German world, where kingdoms or lordships had been founded by conquest, in which case the property of the soil always, or generally, was allotted to the conqueror. Now, as the conquest of the Isle of Man by the Norwegians must have taken place in the 9th century, it is also more likely that the acquisition of the dominium glebæ[a] by the conqueror must have taken place then, than afterwards. It is even not improbable that the surname of Crowan belonged to that conqueror, and not to the Godred of 1080; only the inhabitants of Man, knowing that Godred Crowan was their first Norwegian king, but not remembering any older than Godred son of Harold the Black, identified this Godred with the hero of the legend.

If we are not mistaken it is, or has at least been, usual in the Isle of Man itself, to assign to Godred Crowan some of the oldest pagan monuments without inscriptions, found in the island, greatly anterior to the times of the Christian Godred here spoken of; and this seems to prove that the national legends of Man always regarded Godred Crowan as representing the oldest possible times of the Norwegian settlement in the island. Even what is told of the awe with which he is said to have inspired the Scots, bears evidently a true legendary character. Putting aside, therefore, in this manner, from the history of Godred, as it is told here, what seems to us not strictly historical, we retain as undisputed the fact of his having conquered Man, and the subsequent conquest of Dublin, etc., which is fully confirmed by Irish annals.[b]

The death of Godred the Conqueror is expressly stated in the Irish annals to have taken place in 1095. In the Norwegian Saga of King Hácon IV., the accuracy of which is amply proved, it is said that King

tion of the odallers' rights appears to have been the first step invariably taken by Scandinavian conquerors. The result was taxation, the king, or jarl, asserting his right to the land. His division of the island, he thinks was probably the reason of the two Deemsters or Judges of Man, i. 164, n.]

[a] [Property of the soil.]

[b] [In the Irish annals Godred is surnamed Meranach, or the Bad.—Robertson, i. 164, n.]

Magnus took the Isles from Godred, which shows that Godred must needs have outlived at least the first expedition of Magnus to the Western Islands, which took place in 1093-94. Consequently, the final conquest of Man by Godred, which is stated in the Chronicle itself to have been effected about sixteen years before his death, must have taken place in 1079, or 1080, not in 1075,[a] as the Chronicle has it; that is to say, when the nineteen years are added, of which all the numbers, given in the codex from A.D. 1046 downwards till 1093 are shortcoming.

NOTE 5, p. 54.—*Reliquit sane tres filios, Lagmannum, Haraldum et Olavum: Lagmannus major natu, regnum arripiens, septem annos regnavit.*

The account here given is neither complete nor accurate. It is obvious that in the space between 1095, the real death-year of Godred, and 1098, when King Magnus made his great expedition to the West, there can be no place for the seven years of Lagman's reign, and the subsequent, however short, reigns of Donald and Ingemund. The error must be corrected partly through the Irish annals, partly through the Saga; which likewise being faulty in this point, are in their turn to be rectified by means of the indications contained in those scraps of poems composed by contemporaneous scalds or poets, which, as usual, are quoted in the text itself to corroborate the narrative, but which even the author of the Saga has not understood rightly.

The Saga of King Magnus does not speak of any expedition to the West undertaken by this warlike king previous to that in 1098; while it can be sufficiently proved that he undertook one already in the latter part of 1093, from which he returned in 1094.[b] In the first instance, one of those poetical fragments just mentioned, speaks of King Magnus getting hold of Lagman and keeping him for some time in captivity, which was impossible in 1098, Lagman being then dead and gone; nay, the narrative of the text itself, founded upon these poems at large and verbal traditions, speaks of Godred, the father of Lagman, in terms implying that he was still living when Magnus captured his son.[c] This shows that the first expedition of Magnus at all events took place before 1095. Secondly, Fordun, narrating the events immediately succeeding the death of King Malcolm Ceanmhor in the month of

[a] [Robertson says that Godred conquered Man in 1075, or five years after the invasion of Malcolm, but he does not give any grounds for the statement; i. 163, n.]

[b] [Robertson, i. 165, and Dunham, ii. 265, both assign the first expedition of Magnus to A.D. 1098.]

[c] Snorre, Saga of Magnus Barefoot, ch. 20, 21.

November 1093 says that the brother of Malcolm, Donald Bane, who had resided for a long time in the Isles, was now proclaimed king by a powerful party, and appearing at the head of an army, supported by the Norwegian king, attacked Edinburgh, and got possession of the crown for six months, when he was driven away by Duncan, the son of Malcolm.[a]

These particulars, here mentioned by Fordun, must be looked upon as singularly trustworthy, as they are mostly taken from the annals composed by Thurgot, Prior of Durham and Bishop of St. Andrews, who was an eye-witness of all these events, and, moreover, had resided for a long time in Norway at the court of King Olaf Kyrri, predecessor and father of King Magnus, who therefore must have been personally known to him, and was no doubt always observed by him with an interest excluding all possibility of any mistake.[b] Thus it is evident that King Magnus was present in Scotland at the head of a fleet or an army immediately after the death of Malcolm, which shows, that his first expedition to the West took place towards the end of 1093. His father having died on the 22d Sept. 1093, it could not have been undertaken before that time. The author of the Saga, however, not being aware of the true series of the events, blends both expeditions, that of

[a] Fordun, v. 25-28. [Robertson ridicules the notion of the later Scottish Chroniclers who assert that the cession of the Isles was the price of the assistance of Magnus, which placed Donald Bane upon the throne. He says that he must have been resuscitated from the grave. Donald fell into the hands of Edgar Atheling, who had been sent by William Rufus to place Edgar on the throne of Scotland, A.D. 1097, and was sentenced to pass the remainder of his days in blindness and in chains at Roscolpie or Rescobie in Forfarshire; i. 159.].

[b] Fordun here frequently quotes Thurgot, whose words he seems to have downright transcribed without any alterations. The fate of Thurgot is mentioned by his brother monk Simeon of Durham (*Historia Dunelmensis Ecclesiæ*, Ap. Twysden, p. 206, 207). Thurgot, being one of the hostages for Lindsey, who were to be delivered to King William, escaped to Norway about 1069, and was very friendly received by King Olaf, who took him to his court, and loaded him with honours and presents; it is expressly stated that Thurgot taught him to chaunt the psalms. After a stay of some years at the Norwegian court, and being richly endowed by the king and his magnates, he returned to England, but suffered shipwreck on the English coast, losing all his wealth; he met, however, with a kind reception from Archbishop Walcher of York, at whose recommendation he was received as monk in the monastery of St. Mary at Durham, where in 1086 he succeeded the Prior Aldwine, and having administered the priorate for twenty years, was created Bishop of St. Andrews in Scotland (1106), whence, however, he returned afterwards to his cloister, and died there 1115, leaving the annals above mentioned, which unhappily have been lost, and are only known from the fragments given by Fordun.

1093 and that of 1098, into one, and quotes the verses illustrating the former promiscuously with others referring to the latter, so that it is even sometimes impossible, or at least difficult, to tell what ought to be assigned to the expedition of 1093, and what belongs to that of 1098. So much, however, is sure enough, that whenever we find Lagman or his father mentioned, we may safely refer the particulars therewith connected to the first expedition.

This question being thus sufficiently settled, we return to the seven years assigned by our Chronicle to the reign of Lagman. If this number is not altogether a mistake, it is evident, from what we have just seen, that the period of seven years must begin during the life-time of Godred, and Lagman have been his co-regent or under-king. And indeed the Saga seems to indicate something of just this very kind. It is said here that Godred had appointed Lagman his lieutenant in, and defender of the Northern islands ;[a] and that King Magnus, striving to get hold of him, followed him from island to island, until he caught him near the Isle of Skye, being on the point of crossing over to Ireland, and kept him in chains for a while. Here it is impossible to construe the words as if Godred were already dead ; he is evidently understood by the author to be still alive. And indeed, as Godred, according to the Irish annals, was so much occupied with his affairs in Ireland, and no doubt even regarded Dublin as his principal seat, it was quite natural that he should entrust his other kingdom, or at least the northern part thereof, to his eldest son and heir-presumptive. It is likewise not to be doubted that Lagman intended going to Ireland, because his father was there.

Some more light may be thrown on these things from other sources. Ordericus Vitalis who generally is very accurate and trustworthy, says that the reason why King Magnus made the great expedition in 1098, was this, that having made a treaty with the Irish king Muircertach, and even married his daughter,[b] he found that Muircertach played him false, wherefore he both sent him his daughter back, and afterwards in person went to the West with a powerful fleet.[c] Although this certainly was not the sole motive why Magnus went there, yet there is no reason to question the facts themselves ; the treaty here spoken of

[a] In the verse of the Scald Gisle, Lagman is called Ivistar gramr (the prince of Uist), which seems to indicate that he resided there.

[b] [Moore, in his *Hist. Ireland*, ii. 164, says that Magnus, King of Norway, married his son Sigurd to the daughter of Murkertach, King of Ireland, in 1099 or 1102, and made him King of Man.]

[c] Ordericus Vitalis, ed. Duchesne, p. 767.

must accordingly have taken place before 1098, that is to say, during the first expedition in 1093-94. And why was this treaty made? The Irish annals explain it. Muircertach, grandson of Brian Boromy, who had succeeded his father Tirdelvagh in 1080 as King of Munster, was engaged in a fierce war with his rival for the supreme power, Donald O'Lochlan, King of Ulster. In 1094 the war raged in the neighbourhood of Dublin, and among the princes who fought on Donald's side was Godred, who had brought no less than ninety ships. Muircertach was at first completely routed, but afterwards returning, he got the upper hand over Godred, and expelled him from Dublin.[a] Remembering that just at the same time King Magnus was with his fleet near the coasts of Ireland, we are justified in making the combination that Muircertach sought and obtained his alliance against Godred, and that Magnus took Lagman prisoner chiefly to have a hold upon the father, who might thereby be so much easier compelled to resign his lordship of Dublin to Muircertach.

We have, moreover, an authority in the Saga itself for King Magnus having helped Muircertach to take Dublin, forasmuch as it is said that this was done in 1102, on the last expedition of Magnus to the West.[b] But as it is sure enough that the capture of Dublin by Muircertach took place in 1094, and it has been sufficiently shown that the author of the Saga sometimes assigns to one of the three expeditions what belongs to another, we are fully entitled to believe that the same error has been committed here, and that the author, in speaking of this event, is not mistaken as to the fact, but only as to the time, which was 1094, not 1102. What became of Lagman the Saga does not tell, but finding him afterwards as King of the Isles, and remembering the statement in the Saga of King Hácon, that King Magnus conquered the Isles from Godred, we must needs guess that he was made free on condition that his father not only ceded Dublin to Muircertach, but even, together with Lagman, did homage to the Norwegian king, and acknowledged him as their liege lord.

It is said in the annals of Ulster that Godred died in the year after his expulsion, from the plague; or, according to another translation, of a broken heart;[c] if the latter be the right one, his grief may have been caused partly by his reverses in Ireland, partly by the feuds between his sons. For, from what is explained above, it would appear

[a] *Annals of Ulster*, and *of the Four Masters*.

[b] Saga of Magnus Barefoot, ch. 34.

[c] *Annales Ultonienses*, ed. O'Connor, and the Latin translation of them in Johnstone's *Antiquitates Celto-Normannicæ*.

that the rebellion of Harold against his brother Lagman, had begun during the lifetime of Godred ; the seven years of Lagman's reign being no doubt to be reckoned from 1089 or perhaps even 1088, the very year when the war broke out between Muircertach and Donald. Lagman's death on his voyage to Jerusalem being known at home in 1096 or 1097 (the year 1075 or 1095 given in the Chronicle cannot possibly be admitted, being the death-year of Godred), he must have left his country early in 1096, and cannot have gone very far when death overtook him. It was no doubt his intention to join the Crusaders, now flocking together on their first expedition under Peter of Amiens. The catastrophe of his brother Harold probably occurred in the latter part of 1095, immediately after the death of Godred.[a]

NOTE 6, p. 54.—*Dompnaldum filium Tadc.*

The name Tadc, Tadg, or Teige, is a not uncommon Irish name, and appears especially to have occurred in the O'Brian family. The youngest son of Brian Boromy, who was present at his death, and according to the Njála Saga, lost his hand by the same blow which cut off the head of his father, was called "Tadg," in the Saga *Taðkr ;* and it is not improbable that the Dompnald or Donald, who was sent to Man by Muircertach, himself the grandson of Brian, was a descendant of Tadg, or at least a kinsman of the O'Brians. That the Manxmen should apply to Muircertach for a governor seems to prove that King Magnus must have entrusted him with a kind of plenipotentiary power, or lieutenancy, during his absence, which trust, however, Muircertach must be supposed not to have kept conscientiously.[b]

NOTE 7, p. 56.—*Ingemundus.*

Of this Ingemund nothing is told in the Saga. It is not even possible to guess who he was, or to what family he belonged.

[a] [Godred died in 1095, and, as Lagman reigned seven years and Sigurd the son of Magnus ruled the Orkneys six years, a period altogether of thirteen years, Lagman's death must have occurred in 1108. Robertson supposes that on the retirement of Sigurd, consequent on the death of his father Magnus, Man reverted to its former ruler Lagman. He supposes that Lagman's expiatory pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which he never lived to accomplish, was undertaken in 1108 ; i. 346.]

[b] [Donald MacTeige was nephew to Murktagh O'Brien, being his brother's son. He had already given considerable trouble in his own country, and a desire to get rid of an impracticable kinsman may have had its weight in leading the Irish king to accede to the request of the Manxmen. Olave, the youngest son of Godred, heir to the Manx throne, was at that time a minor, residing at the English court. This is sufficient to account for the appointment of a regent or guardian, without associating it with a dependency on Norway.]

NOTE 8, p. 56.—*Fundata est abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Cystercii.*

This entry, as well as the next, about the capture of Antioch, and the apparition of the comet, is taken from the Chronicle of Melrose. The rest, however, including the definition of a comet, is original. The battle here spoken of between the inhabitants of Man seems rather to have been the effect of an attempt on the part of the native Manxmen to shake off the yoke of the Norwegians, than a fighting between northern or southern islanders, from the names of the opposite chiefs, Earl Other or Ottar, and Macmaras; the former being a Norwegian one, the latter a Celtic. The word "Aquilonares" ought perhaps to be translated, not "the inhabitants of North-Man," but the "Northmen."[a]

NOTE 9, p. 56.—*Eodem anno Magnus rex Norwegiæ, etc.*

It is true that King Magnus made his second expedition to the West in 1098, and in so far the Chronicle is right, but it errs greatly in speaking of one expedition only, and of the fall of King Magnus, which did not occur till 1103, on his third expedition, as if it happened on his second one. The whole entry comprises, accordingly, a space of six years, from 1098 till 1103 *inclusive*. Nor is the motive here assigned to his enterprise the true one, as everybody may see, even without farther explanation; it may have been a legend or tradition, current in Man; but even this tradition seems to have been derived from what is told in the Saga of the grandfather of Magnus, King Harold, that on the eve of his sailing for England in 1066, he had the shrine of St. Olaf opened, cut the nails and the hair of the Saint, and having re-closed and locked the shrine threw the key into the sea; it is expressly added that the shrine was not opened for the next 180 years, so that it is impossible that King Magnus could have done it.[b] The real motive why Magnus issued forth on this expedition was evidently, as

[a] [But the text says that the battle was fought *inter Mannenses, i.e.*, between the Manx themselves, and not *inter Mannenses* and Aquilonares, *i.e.*, between the Manx and the Northmen. Unless the text be corrupt, Aquilonares must mean the Manx of the North. Robertson considers them to be the original clans connected with the Northmen of Dublin and the Isles, whilst the Southerns he considers to be the descendants of the Islesmen who had contributed to the success of Godred Crowan. The South was the seat of the civil and ecclesiastical government, and he thinks that the distinction between North and South was preserved by Godred's descendants through motives of policy, in order to maintain their own ascendancy, by holding the balance between the two races; i. 349 and 166.]

[b] Snorre, Saga of Harold Harðráði, ch. 83, cfr. Hrokkinskinna, Har. H. S., ch. 114.

the Saga tells, to secure his power in the Orkneys and the Western Islands. We learn farther, from Ordericus Vitalis, as we have seen, that Muircertach had broken the treaty; and the troubles in the Isle of Man just mentioned might in themselves alone have afforded sufficient reason for Magnus to revisit that part of his dominions. Moreover, we learn from Fordun, that, in 1097, Eadgar, the son of King Malcolm, appeared in Scotland with an English army, and made fierce war upon Donald Bane, the protegé of King Magnus, who had reascended the throne in 1095, after the fall of Duncan, and this war, which ended with the captivity of Donald, was not brought to an issue, when Magnus arrived in Scotland in 1098 ;[a] it is therefore very probable that Donald Bane had implored the aid of Magnus, and was the chief inducement for the latter to go.

The fleet of King Magnus is stated by Ordericus to have contained sixty ships,[b] while our Saga gives the number of 160. This is to be explained in this way, that the total number of ships collected in Norway was 160, but that the effective force, with which he arrived at Man, and Anglesey, consisted only of sixty. The fleets of the Norwegian kings in those days were formed of two distinct parts, the *leiðangr* ships, *i.e.*, those furnished and manned by the population at large, distributed for this purpose into certain districts, and those belonging to the king himself and his barons; the former being generally of the smaller kind, and the crew not obliged to serve for more than two months a year, did not count for much, but the chief and really formidable force consisted of the other part, being large, well-built ships, strongly manned by select and well-trained warriors, and obliged to serve for an indefinite time. Generally, therefore, we find, that on expeditions of longer duration the *leiðangr* ships soon returned home, leaving the royal and baronial ships alone to fight out the war; and the average number of these ships was exactly sixty. So it therefore must also have been the case with the fleet of King Magnus, that shortly after his arrival in the West the *leiðangr* part returned, while the main force, being sixty sail strong, remained.

The Saga gives us the names of several barons who accompanied the king; we learn, even, that he brought with him his son Sigurd, then only eight years of age, in order to appoint him his lieutenant in those parts. The Chronicle is right in saying that King Magnus subdued the Orkneys, as we learn from the Saga that at his arrival he took the reigning earls, Paul and Erlend, prisoners, and sent them to

[a] Fordun, v. 34, x. 19. [See also Lingard, i. pp. 526-529.]

[b] Ordericus Vitalis, Ap. Duchesne, p. 767.

Norway, whence they did not return, while he carried with him the sons of Erlend, Magnus (afterwards Saint Magnus), and Erling; the earls must therefore either have shown symptoms of disaffection or the king simply have wanted these possessions for himself or for his son. In the Saga, Magnus is said next to have attacked and ravaged Lewis, when the inhabitants were either massacred or put to flight, no doubt in retaliation of what was done to Ingemund; even Uist, Skye, Tirce, and Mull, underwent the same treatment. Iona, however, was left unhurt, because of its sanctity, and the Saga tells, that the king opened "the little church of Columkill" (now St. Oran's Chapel), and was about to enter, but stopped on the threshold, locked the door, and forbade anybody to enter it afterwards. It is added that since that time it was not opened; which, however, is only to be understood of the period before 1220, when this account appears to have been written.[a] From Iona he went to Isla, and from there to Cantire, ravaging as well the coasts of Ireland as those of Scotland; perhaps it was at this period that he sent the Irish princess back to her father. Ordericus says that he found the coasts of Ireland too well defended to effect any great achievements; the annals of Ulster say even that three Norwegian ships were taken by the Ultonians, and the men killed.

NOTE 10, p. 58.—*Cumque applicuisset ad insulam sancti Patricii . . . . nuncupantur.*

This seems to imply that the place named *Sandvað* (*vadum arenosum*), where the battle was fought between the inhabitants of Man themselves, was situated in the neighbourhood of Holm Peel.[b] That Magnus, as it is stated here, should have chosen Man for his own future residence, is impossible, and only an exaggeration; he destined it probably to be the residence of his son and vassal King Sigurd, and not for himself, as the author may have supposed. What, however, is said about the fortresses erected by Magnus seems to be true; firstly, because these fortresses still bore his name when this part of the Chronicle was composed, viz., about 1260; secondly, because we find that King Magnus erected similar forts at other conquered places, which he desired to secure, for instance at Kvaldensey, on the lake of Wener, in Sweden, against which he made war in 1100 and 1101. This fortress was chiefly of wood, a kind of block-house; as even those in Man

[a] Snorre, Saga of Magnus Barefoot, ch. 10. Fagrskinna, ch. 229, 230.

[b] [There were two places called the Island of St. Patrick—Holm Peel, and Jurby Point. It is at the latter that Dr. Oliver places Santwat, or Sandwith.]

seem to have been, as it is expressly stated that the Galwegians were pressed to cut wood and carry timber for their construction. It is no doubt the same fact to which Ordericus Vitalis alludes, saying that King Magnus got people to settle on the island, as the population was extremely thinned, and gave them houses and other necessary things, and that likewise he visited some of the other islands, and arranged large settlements there, occupying himself with these affairs for several years, in order to strengthen his power.[a] It may be that not a few of his warriors, pleased with the fertility and amenity of the island, settled there permanently, and that new colonists from Norway were sent for and encouraged; but the houses here mentioned were no doubt chiefly the fortresses. If quite a new colonisation had taken place on the large scale which Orderic seems to indicate, the Saga would certainly not have been silent about it.

NOTE 11, p. 58.—*Ad Moiniam insulam, etc.*

This affair, and the combat with the Hugos, is mentioned also in the sagas, as well as by most of the English annalists who narrated the events of these times. The Saga, however, as usual, describes only the fight, without mentioning the motives, which caused it. These we learn chiefly from Caradoc of Lhancarvan and Ordericus Vitalis. There raged at this time a fierce war between the Welsh and the Norman earls of the Marches, the principal of whom was Hugh, Earl of Chester, called *grossus*, because of his extreme fatness.[b] In the beginning of A.D. 1098, Hugh, together with his namesake, Hugh of Montgomery, Earl of Salop, aided by a traitor among the Welsh themselves, attacked North-Wales with a large army, and penetrated without any obstacle as far as into Anglesey; the Welsh king Griffith, and his relation Cadogon, being unable to make any resistance, proceeded to Ireland to apply for assistance against the invaders. It would appear, although it is not expressly stated anywhere, that Griffith on his way visited Man, and solicited King Magnus, whose arrival in these parts with a powerful fleet must have been generally known, to help him: or that Magnus, hearing of the doings at Anglesey, resolved to go there on his own accord, and endeavour to gain something for himself. According to Orderic he came with only six ships, and entered the Menai Straits,

[a] Ordericus, p. 767.

[b] Even in the Saga he is called *Hugi Digri* (*i.e.* the fat); the same epithet is preserved by Ordericus, calling him "*dirgane*," which is only a wrong spelling of the Norse "*digran*," (acc. sing. of *digr*).

carrying a red shield on the mast, the usual sign of peace and commercial intercourse. The Norman warriors, however, would not permit him to land, and assembled in great number under the command of both Hughs; there ensued in consequence vehement fighting, or rather exchange of missiles, the Normans being on shore, the Norwegians on board their ships. Hugh of Salop was killed by an arrow, and finally the Normans were put to flight.

According to the Saga it was the king himself who shot Earl Hugh, or who at least got the credit of having done so; his ship, it is told, being nearest to the shore, he stood on the forecastle shooting arrows from a long-bow at the enemy, and seeing Earl Hugh advancing, he persuaded a man from Halogaland (the northernmost part of Norway), who was standing close by, likewise shooting, that they should both at once aim at the earl; this done, one of the arrows struck the "*nef-björg*" (the piece of iron protecting the nose), and caused it to bend sidewards; the other entered the eye and came out behind, killing the earl immediately: it was, however, impossible to say which of the two arrows was shot by the king, yet the man, to flatter the king, gave him the honour of having shot the fatal one. It was, says the Saga, a most singular luck to hit the earl in this way, as he was clad in armour from head to foot, leaving nothing bare except the eyes.

Giraldus Cambrensis, who narrates this event, obviously from local evidences, without knowing a word of the sagas, strongly corroborates the above narrative, and does not even hesitate in the least to name the commander of the foreign ships, whom he apparently does not know to have been the King of Norway, as the killer of the earl. When Hugh of Salop, he says, together with the Earl of Chester, had entered by force the church of St. Tefredauc in Anglesey, and left some dogs there, these were found mad in the morning; and a month afterwards he came himself to an untimely end, as there arrived some pirates with ships of war from Orkney, whom he gallantly went to meet into the very sea, bestriding a noble steed; the commander of the enemy's force, however, named Magnus, standing with his bow forward in his ship, let fly an arrow, which, although the earl was clad in iron armour from head to foot, entered his right eye, and went through the brains, so that he fell dying into the water; when the victor saw him falling, he is said to have exclaimed triumphantly in the Danish tongue *leit loupe*, *i.e.*, "let leap," and from this time the English lost their dominion in Anglesey.[a]

[a] Giraldus, *Itinerarium Cambriæ*, p. 867. The "leit loupe" is a slight variation of the Norwegian "*lát hlaupa*."

According to Ordericus,[a] King Magnus, having ascertained that it was the earl himself whom he had killed, expressed his regret, and offered Earl Hugh of Chester peace and security, saying that he had come to conquer Ireland, not England, nor other foreign lands, and only to maintain his authority in islands already belonging to his dominions. Here, however, Ordericus must be mistaken, as it is certain that he appropriated to himself the dominion of Anglesey, and that this island was for many years reckoned among the Norwegian possessions in the west.[b] Even William of Malmesbury asserts that Magnus "fiercely assaulted England in attacking Anglesey."[c] Nor is it improbable that the Welsh of Anglesey, who reaped the sole fruit of the battle which cost Magnus dearly, gratified him with a show of homage, by which they did not mean to bind themselves very strictly, and which could not in any case have been so burthensome to them as the English yoke. It is told by Caradoc, that Magnus, on his last expedition to the West, in 1102-3, was kindly received in Anglesey, and got the permission of Griffith to cut as much timber there as he wanted. Perhaps this was construed by the Norwegians as a sign of submission on the part of Griffith and his Welshmen.[d]

It was undoubtedly the intention of Magnus at this time to punish Muircertach, but he was prevented from doing so, either by his severe loss in the battle of Anglesey, or, as is probable, by the necessity in which he may have found himself to turn his forces against Scotland. As at this time, it would seem, Eadgar, the son of Malcolm, had captured his rival Donald Bane, and as Donald was the ancient ally of Magnus, it was but natural that the latter should intervene on his behalf, and attempt to effect his delivery. It is even far from improbable that Eadgar, not acknowledging the right of Magnus to the Isles, had expressed his intention to reunite them with the Crown of Scotland; and that Magnus, hearing of this, deemed it necessary to threaten him with an attack. The Saga tells that the King of the Scots sent a

[a] Ordericus, p. 768. As the place, where the battle was fought, he names the rock Dagannoth, where the lieutenant of Earl Hugh of Chester, Robert Marquis of Rhuddlar, had built a castle (cfr. p. 670).

[b] Ordericus seems on the whole not to be thoroughly acquainted with these facts, as he contradicts himself in some points.

[c] William of Malmesbury, iv. 329.

[d] William of Malmesbury, iv. 329. [Dunham says that the statement of the conquest of the whole island will obtain little credit with any reader. The truth, he says, seems to be that he made some of the chiefs do homage for their respective dominions; but they reasserted their independence the moment he had left the shores, ii. p. 266.]

message to Magnus, asking him to abstain from hostilities against Scotland, and offering him the cession of all those Western Islands between which and the mainland the Norwegian king could go in a vessel with a paddle rudder, on which condition peace really was concluded.[a] This evidently infers that Magnus had threatened Eadgar with war, and as the thing in itself is very probable, there is all reason to believe the whole transaction to be strictly true. Magnus may have ascertained that Donald Bane, now being blind and degraded, was past hope of ever recovering the power, and therefore found the best thing he could do, was to make peace with Eadgar on good conditions. It is even most likely that it was agreed to strengthen the treaty by a marriage between Magnus and Mathilda, the sister of Eadgar. For in the Saga there are still three verses preserved, composed by Magnus himself in honour of "Mathilda, the fair maid, who defends her country with the shield," and whom he is most anxious to behold, but fears that he shall not enjoy this happiness.[b] In the Saga this Mathilda is called the daughter of the emperor; but there was at this time no daughter of the emperor with the name of Mathilda, nor is it likely, even if such a person existed, that Magnus should have proposed to her.[c] The Saga moreover is mistaken in calling the Scottish king Malcolm, instead of Eadgar, no doubt misled by the Scottish denomination "Etgar Mac Malcolm." It is certain the marriage was never effected, Mathilda having been given to King Henry of England in 1100; this, however, explains itself readily from the superiority of King Henry in those parts, and even the substance of the verses themselves indicate the misgivings of the royal author that the union so much coveted was not to be after all. Certain it is, that from this time the Norwegian kings dated their real possession of the Sudreys, among which they also counted the peninsula of Cantire; be-

[a] [At this date the Western Islands can hardly have been included amongst the dependencies of the Scottish crown.—Robertson, i. 167.]

[b] Snorre, Saga of Magnus Barefoot, ch. 18.

[c] [One can easily understand such license in a poetic effusion. Matilda was descended from Agatha, daughter, or perhaps only a relative, of the Emperor of Germany, who had married Edward, a son of Edmund Ironside. Margaret, one of their daughters, had married Malcolm, King of Scotland, and Matilda was one of the children born of that marriage: she was grand-daughter to Agatha. In her childhood she had worn the veil in the convent of Winton, over which her aunt Christina was abbess, in order to preserve her chastity against the brutality of the Norman soldiers: but in a synod of prelates, November 11, 1100, she was pronounced free to marry, and was accordingly married to Henry I. of England, by Archbishop Anselm.—Ling. i. 303-527, ii. 6.]

cause Magnus, imitating the old fabulous sea-king Beite, of whom a similar story is told, had his vessel drawn across the narrow isthmus of Tarbet, while he himself sat at the helm.[a]

It is said in the Saga that during this expedition King Magnus effected a marriage between his son Sigurd, then only nine years of age, with Biadmuin, daughter of Muircertach, being only five years old, and that he constituted him king of all Norwegian possessions in the West. That the marriage did not take place till in 1102, on the king's third expedition, is evident from the Irish and Welsh annals, as will be seen by-and-by; and it is most likely, nay, almost certain, that the Saga has likewise misplaced the other event, the proper moment for conferring on the prince the title of king being surely the day of his marriage, especially as Sigurd had then just completed his twelfth year, which was the very term for coming of age among the Norwegians in those times. Between Muircertach and Magnus there was apparently no contact at all during this expedition, whatever might have been the cause. That Magnus intended to make war upon him, must be regarded as certain; but no doubt, as we have already seen, partly the preparations of Muircertach himself, and partly the expeditions of Magnus against Wales and Scotland, averted the blow from Ireland in 1098. He passed, however, the winter either at Man, or in the Isles, probably intending to attack Ireland in the spring of 1099; but it is expressly stated in the Saga that many of his men, wearied by being absent from their home for such a length of time, left him without leave before the winter set in. We might guess, therefore, that when spring returned he did not feel himself strong enough to invade Ireland with the certainty of effecting anything worth the exertion. Moreover, as soon after his return to Norway we find him engaged in a war with Sweden, it may be that the news received from those parts induced him to shorten his stay in the West, and to forego for the moment his plans against Ireland, postponing them till better times. This indeed appears to us the simplest way of explaining the matter. Certain it seems, that King Magnus, on his return to Norway in the summer 1099, left his son Sigurd at Orkney.

The Saga remarks expressly that during this long stay in the West King Magnus and his men adopted the dress usual among the Western islanders, viz., short coats and bare legs, which caused the Norwegians to give him the nickname of "bare-leg" or "bare-foot." This shows that the characteristic Highland dress was even then the national one among the inhabitants of western Scotland.

[a] [See Robertson, i. 167.]

In the years of 1100 and 1101 Magnus was occupied with the Swedish war. In 1102, however, he went forth on his last expedition, which this time was undertaken directly against Ireland. What the Chronicle tells about his sending his shoes to King Muircertach and the unconditional submission of the latter, seems to be a mere fable ;[a] yet if something like it took place, it must have been in the winter immediately preceding the expedition. From the Irish and Welsh annals, as well as from Orderic, we learn how matters stood with Muircertach. His war with Donald O'Lochlan raged more fiercely than ever ; and although, on the whole, Muircertach had the upper hand, yet Donald was an obstinate and dangerous foe, against whom he felt the necessity of strengthening himself through alliance with other powerful rulers. Shortly before, King Henry I. (Beauclerc) had ascended the English throne, excluding, as is well known, his senior brother Robert, Duke of Normandy, with whom he had to sustain a hard feud. Among the Barons who embraced the party of Robert were the two brothers of the above mentioned Earl Hugh Montgomery, who was killed by King Magnus, Robert of Belesme, who after the fall of Hugh had purchased his earldom, having besides many other possessions in England, as well as in Normandy,[b] and Arnulf, who had Dyved and Pembroke in Wales. Robert made an alliance with the three Welsh princes, Jorwerth, Cadogan, and Meredith, sons of Blethyn, and Arnulf sought the alliance of Muircertach, asking, through ambassadors, his daughter Lafracot in marriage, to which Muircertach immediately gave his consent, promising not only to support Arnulf against the English king, but also to make him his successor.[c] In this manner a rather strong league had been formed against King Henry ; and as the allied lords and princes, especially the two Montgomerys, as avengers of their brother, must at the same time have been the enemies of King Magnus, this prince was

[a] [This tale is said to be unknown to the Irish and Norse chroniclers ; but a writer in *Notes and Queries* cites some verses from Lyschander's *Chronicon Groenlandiæ Rythmicon*, which seem to refer to this token of subjection exacted by Magnus. He supposes that the throwing of the slipper at weddings was meant to betoken the subjection of the newly married woman to her husband.

He sent to Ireland his dirty shoes,
And commanded the king who lived there,
To wear them with honour
On Christmas day in his royal state,
And to own that he had his power and kingdom
From the Lord of Norway and the Isles.—4 S. ix. March 30, '72, p. 258.]

[b] Ordericus, p. 768. In Maine there exist still traditions about the tyranny of Robert ; vide Lappenberg, *Geschichte Englands*, ii. s. 232.

[c] Ordericus, p. 868, cfr. Caradoc.

consequently brought somehow into a friendly relation with the English monarch, notwithstanding that Henry, if the conjecture which we ventured to utter above be right, had married the destined bride of Magnus. Yet it must be remembered that Magnus himself, during his absence, had married the Swedish princess Margaret, and no doubt given up all enmity, if any such existed, against Henry; while through the peace concluded in 1098 with Eadgar of Scotland, the friend and *protégé* of the English king, a reconciliation between their party and King Magnus may already be said to have been partly effected.

We learn from the Welsh chronicles and the Irish annals that Magnus before visiting Ireland landed at Man, where he, as it were, established his head-quarters, erecting forts as before, and making a personal visit to Anglesey, where prince Griffith received him cordially, and, as mentioned above, gave him permission to cut what timber he might require for his fortifications.[a] Meanwhile matters had gone wrong with the Hiberno-British league. Robert of Montgomery was declared an outlaw, and several of his castles taken; one of the Welsh princes had been induced to embrace the king's part; Arnulf of Montgomery had betaken himself to the court of Muircertach, craving assistance, but the latter, far from being able to afford any, on the contrary was expecting aid from Arnulf against Magnus.[b] Under these circumstances Muircertach found it safest first to make peace, or truce for a year with Donald O'Lochlan, and then to enter into negotiations with Magnus. In what manner these negotiations were conducted is nowhere told; we learn only from the Irish annals that the peace was concluded for a year (no doubt to be renewed at the expiration of this term), and that Muircertach gave his daughter in marriage to Sigurd, the son of Magnus, who was now proclaimed king of the western possessions.[c]

It has already been mentioned that the Saga wrongly speaks of this marriage as having taken place during the former expedition of

[a] Vide Caradoc.

[b] There is a letter preserved from Muircertach to the celebrated Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury (*Anselmi epistolæ*, iv. 85), in which the Irish king thanks the prelate for the assistance given to his son-in-law Arnulf. The letter must have been written about this time.

[c] The Irish annals, especially those of the Four Masters; where it is expressly stated that Muircertach gave his daughter to "Sichraid," son of Magnus, with many precious gifts. Caradoc says expressly that Magnus built three castles in the Isle of Man, had his son married with the daughter of Muircertach, and named him King of Man. The name of the princess has been preserved in the Saga only, it was Biadmynja or Biadhmuin.

Magnus, and that it likewise wrongly makes Magnus and Muircertach together conquer Dublin in 1102, this conquest having been effected during the first expedition of Magnus in 1093. Yet it would seem, and it must be taken almost for certain, that by the treaty of 1102 Muircertach ceded to Magnus the district of Dublin, which may have been regarded as an appendage of the kingdom of Man; partly because it is not likely that Magnus should have accorded to Muircertach the peace, and moreover, as will be seen, his powerful assistance against Donald O'Lochlan for nothing, partly because Ordericus states expressly, that Magnus established colonies of Northmen even in Ireland,[a] which could not have been done if he had not got a territory to dispose of. And lastly, if there be any truth at bottom in the anecdote about the shoes, it is to be supposed that Muircertach acknowledged Magnus as his suzerain, and paid a kind of homage to him as such, not, however, intending to keep any of the given promises longer than necessity compelled him to do so. Ordericus states expressly that Muircertach acted treacherously towards Magnus, as well as towards Arnulf. It is easy to see from the following facts that the principal object of Muircertach was to crush his Irish rivals, and that to this end he deemed it necessary to secure the powerful assistance of Magnus, with the hope, perhaps, of having afterwards an opportunity to get rid of him. The treaty was strengthened by giving hostages from both sides. Among the Norwegian hostages was the Icelandic poet Gisl Illugason,[b] from whose poem in honour of King Magnus several fragments are quoted in the Saga, to corroborate the facts there mentioned.

[a] Ordericus, p. 812. "Magnus — —. desertas cum ingenti classe insulas usque in Hiberniam introivit, ibique colonis callide constitutis, oppida et villas aliarum more gentium construi præcepit." [Munch's conclusion is not warranted by the text. Orderic says that he established his colonies *cunningly*, which would have been unnecessary if the territory had been at his disposal.]

[b] The Saga of the holy bishop John of Hólar in Iceland, Biskupa Sögur, 1, 227. Here the following curious story is told:—With the hostages there was a Norwegian, who boasted of being well versed in the Irish language, and offered to salute King Muircertach in the name of the others, which being allowed, he said, "*male diarik*," which, however, means "damned be thou, O king!" Then another of the Norwegians put in his word, saying: "My Lord, this man is only the slave of the Norwegians;" to which the king replied "*algeira ragall*," which means "difficult to know is the dark riddle" (*gáta*), or "road" (*gata*). Those of our readers who are acquainted with the Irish language may perhaps be able to suggest the correct forms of the Irish words here reproduced, no doubt in a very bad shape. [His Grace, the most Rev. John Mac Hale, Archbishop of Tuam, an accomplished Irish scholar, says that the words, though mutilated, are perfectly intelligible, and without any effort of fancy or conjecture may be thus written: *Malact de Duit le rix: The curse of God on you, king.*]

Arriving in Ireland, Magnus was friendly received by Muircertach, and no doubt got possession of Dublin with its district, where he effected the settlements spoken of by Orderic, which appear rather to have been castles and strongholds, like those erected in Man and the Isles. In the winter, the Saga tells, Magnus was the guest of Muircertach in his residence of Kinkora,[a] and in the next spring, it is farther told, both kings went to Ulster, where they fought many battles, and conquered a part of Ulster. This is true, in so far, as really the hostilities between Muircertach and the northern Irish commenced anew in 1103, no doubt because the truce had expired, and that several battles were fought as we learn from the Irish annals. But as to the conquests in Ulster, it is far from any such thing having taken place ; as, on the contrary, Muircertach and his allies were the losing party. The Irish annals say, that Muircertach, having encamped with his army, consisting of the men from Munster, Leinster, Ossory, Meath, and Connaught, on the plains of Cobha (in the north part of Downshire), he divided his forces, going with one part to Dalaraide (the district on the coast south-east of Lough Neagh), leaving the rest at Cobha, where during his absence it was attacked and completely routed by Donald O'Lochlan on the 5th of August. Among the number of the killed there were also, according to the Irish annals, "foreigners from Dublin," three of whom are expressly named, viz. "Thorstain mac Eric," "Poll mac Amaind," and "Beollan armuinn," the two former, at least, being entirely Scandinavian (Thorstein Ericson and Paul Amundson) ; maybe these "foreigners" were Norwegians from the army of Magnus, although it is to be supposed that the Norwegian king with his main force was on board his fleet, ravaging the coasts, while Muircertach made war on land, and that the diversion of the latter to Dalaraide was effected in order to meet and operate in conjunction with Magnus. In any case it is evident that the defeat at Cobha put an end to the operations, as it is expressly stated in the Saga that the expedition to Ulster having been ended, Muircertach returned to Kinkora, and Magnus prepared to go home ; these preparations, however, must have taken place immediately after the battle at Cobha, as the fall of Magnus occurred only nineteen days afterwards, on St. Bartholomew's Day.

This catastrophe is said by Ordericus to have been caused by the treachery of the Irish, who induced him to leave the ships, and hazard

[a] This name, more correctly spelled *Ceann Caraidh*, has been confounded by the author of the Saga with Connaught, *Kankaraborg* or *Kankarar*, having evidently been misread as *Kunnaktaborg*, *Kunnaktir*.

himself with a small force into the interior of the country, making him believe that they intended to offer their submission, but afterwards suddenly attacking him with immensely superior numbers. This seems very probable in itself, but it ought to be remembered, that the Saga, founded upon traditions from the men who were present at the battle themselves, does not give the least hint of anything like treachery on the part of Muircertach. Magnus, it is said, wanting meat for the support of his army, despatched men to Muircertach, requesting him to furnish the necessary number of cattle; which request having been complied with, but the march of the cattle taking longer time than expected, Magnus, growing impatient, went imprudently too far up in the country to see if they did not appear, and was attacked by the Irish. If, at this time, Muircertach had already returned to Kinkora, it seems not likely that Magnus should have sent his men so far; probably, however, Muircertach had not yet left the neighbourhood of Dalaraide, and in this case could not comply otherwise with the request than by compelling the inhabitants, or helping the Norwegian emissaries in compelling them, to yield up the prescribed number of cattle, a measure by which the men of Ulster would no doubt feel greatly exasperated, and become eager for revenge, without any instigation from Muircertach, or concerting of treacherous measures with him. Indeed, the annals of Ulster, where the particulars must have been well known, say only that Magnus was attacked and killed by the Men of Ulster on a plundering expedition. The particulars of the battle are most circumstantially and forcibly told in the Saga, which, however, does not mention, what is told only in the Chronicle of Man, that the body of the king was buried at St. Patrick's Church in Down. Maybe his remains may still be found there. It is evident that he was buried by the Irish, not by his own men, who were obliged to leave the body on the battle-field, and that this must have been in the neighbourhood of Down; his fleet probably still lying at the same spot where it was when the battle was fought at Cobha.[a]

[a] [Robertson supposes that the defeat of Murketagh O'Brien by the northern Hy Nial, early in the month, may have prevented or delayed the despatch of the cattle, and that Magnus disembarked to ascertain the fate of the scouts, and to victual his fleet at the expense of the men of Uladh; that he became entangled amongst the neighbouring morasses; that his retreat was intercepted by the Ulstermen; and that, through the cowardice or treachery of one of his principal officers, who fled instead of covering his retreat, he fell with many of his followers. He would easily be known by his shining helmet and breastplate, and by the golden lion on the red shield—the device of the Norwegian kings. When expostulated with by his courtiers for rashly exposing himself in battle, Magnus replied:

At the death of Magnus, his men abandoned all newly acquired possessions in the West, and hastened homewards, taking with them prince Sigurd, who left his bride, the daughter of Muircertach, saying, according to the Saga, that all lords in the West, Scotch as well as Irish, were odious to him. This certainly might be construed as indicating that Sigurd himself suspected the Irish of treachery against his father, yet such an interpretation of the words is by no means necessary. After all, however, Muircertach turned out to be really a traitor; immediately after the fall of Magnus he courted very submissively the friendship of the English king, took his daughter back from Arnulf, and gave her to another man; nay, he even planned schemes against his life, which also, perhaps, Arnulf might have lost, if he had not been warned in time, and made his escape to Normandy.[a]

The author of our Chronicle, in assigning six years to the reign of Magnus in the Isles, must needs have meant to begin it with the year of his second expedition, viz. 1098, which being the first, 1103 will be the last. So badly, however, the numbers of the years are added, that the accession of Olaf, son of Godred Crowan, is said to have taken place in 1102, although it is expressly stated that Olaf was not made king till after the death of Magnus. That Magnus was killed in 1103, is certain enough, and corroborated by many authorities, especially that of Ordericus Vitalis.[b]

NOTE 12, p. 60.—*Olavus filius Godredi . . .* XL *annis.*

That the year in which the reign of Olaf commenced was 1103, and not 1102, is already shown. Likewise it is a mistake, arising from the careless way in which the ciphers of the years are added, that Olaf is said to have reigned forty years only; he was not killed in 1142 or 1143, as it is said afterwards in the Chronicle (and which certainly gives a period of forty years from 1102 or 1103), but in 1153, the Chronicle

"It is better for a people to have a brave than an old king."—Robertson, i. 169. Dunham ii. 267.]

[a] William of Malmesbury, v. 409, cfr. Ordericus.

[b] Even in the Saga the year is clearly enough indicated, as the king is said to have been killed on a Monday, being also the day of St. Bartholomew. This exactly agrees with the year 1103. [As already noticed, Robertson makes Lagman re-occupy the throne of Man after the death of Magnus, and reign until 1108, when, from remorse at his own cruelty to his brother, he undertook the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. He allots four years to the regency of Mac Teige and Ingemund, and makes Olave, then probably of age, to begin his reign in 1112.—i. 346-7.]

itself stating expressly that it was the same year in which St. Bernard of Clairvaux and King David of Scotland died, viz. 1153.[a] This is rather a remarkable instance of the author having been misled by his own inaccuracy. Olaf is mentioned also in the Orkneyinga Saga, with the curious surname of *Bitlingr* (the little bit), the cause of which appellation is not explained.[b] That Olaf did homage to the Norwegian kings is nowhere mentioned. He may have done it for all we know of it, but it seems more likely that during his long reign the connexion with Norway was rather loose, it being expressly stated, as we see, that he kept so close a confederacy with the kings of Scotland and Ireland, that nobody dared to disturb his kingdom as long as he lived.[c]

NOTE 13, p. 60.—*Habuit et concubinas plures, etc.*

Among these concubines, as they are styled here, one, however, seems to have been his legitimate second wife, viz. *Ingibjörg*, daughter of Hácon, Earl of Orkney, and sister to Harold, Earl of Orkney, as well as to Margaret, the wife of Madadh, Earl of Atholl.[d] The Orkney Saga states expressly that Ingibjörg was married to King Olaf; and, indeed, it is not to be supposed that a lady of such illustrious birth and connections should degrade herself as to become a concubine even of a king. Ingibjörg, however, being born after the death of King Magnus and the firm establishment of her father in the Orkneys, that is to say about 1105-10, cannot have been married till about 1125, while the marriage of King Olaf with Afreca of Galloway no doubt took place shortly after the accession of Olaf to the throne.

NOTE 14, p. 60.—*Sumerledo regulo Herergaidel.*

This *Sumarliði* or *Somerled*, the celebrated ruler of Argyle, who is also mentioned in the Orkney saga, and in the saga of King Hácon Hákonsson as the founder of his dynasty, is styled king or "petty king" only in this Chronicle and the Irish annals. The sagas do not mention his father, but from a genealogy, preserved it would seem among his descendants, the Mac Donalds, and printed in Johnstone's *Antiquitates Celto-Normannicæ*, p. 152, we learn that he was son of Gilbrigid, and

[a] Vide *Chronica de Mailros* and others. [King David died May 24, 1153. St. Bernard died August 20, 1153. Olave was slain by Reginald, Harold's son, on the 29th of June.]

[b] A *varians lectio* gives the form *klíningr*, i.e., "bread and butter."

[c] Towards the close of his reign, however, his son and future successor Godred, as we see, found it necessary to go to Norway and offer his homage to King Inge.

[d] Orkney Saga, p. 138.

grandson of Gil-Adomnan.[a] Skene (*Highlanders in Scotland*, v. ii. p. 40, 41) informs us, from two curious old Gaelic MSS., that Gil-Adomnan was driven out from his possessions in Scotland by the violence of the Lochlans and Fingalls (*i.e.*, the Norwegians), and took refuge in Ireland, and that Gillebridd, as it would appear, made an unsuccessful attempt to recover his paternal lands, which, however, was at last effected by Somerled, who "put himself at the head of the inhabitants of Morven, and by a series of rapid attacks succeeded, after considerable struggle, in expelling the Norwegians, and making himself master of the whole of Morven, Lochaber, and north Argyle," to which he soon afterwards added the southern district of Argyle. Perhaps we may be able to carry the genealogy still farther up than to Gil-Adomnan. In the *Annals of the Four Masters* it is stated that "Somerled, son of Gilbrigid, king of Innsie Gall" (*i.e.*, the Sudreys), died in 1083. It seems evident from the repetition of the personal names that this Somerled was the father of Gil-Adomnan, and that, being originally and properly Lord of Argyle, he had also acquired some of the adjacent isles, as Jura, Mull, etc., enough to procure him the title of Insular king. We might even be inclined to think that Gil-Adomnan, being, as we presume, his son, was expelled his dominions by Godred of Man, not, as Mr. Skene suggests, by Magnus of Norway, who already found Godred and Lagman fully established in the Isles. Indeed the chief family possessions of Godred, being as demonstrated above, the island of Isla, which is next to Jura and Argyle, we may guess that not only in the earlier years of Godred, before he conquered Man, but even in the times of their respective ancestors, there existed constant feuds between both families, such as generally used to rage among neighbouring clans in those days, and that the expulsion of Gil-Adomnan to Ireland was only a continuation of ancient conflicts. Seeing, farther, that the Norwegian name of Somerled, which appears twice in the dynasty, indicates some connection with Norwegian families, and that the powerful Earl Sigurd, the father of Thorfinn, had really a son his first-born, named Somerled, while the husband of his sister, the Sudreyan earl, is called "Gille" (*i.e.*, Gilbrigid, Gilchrist, Gil-Adomnan, or another similar name), we find it rather likely that Somerled the elder was a descendant of Earl "Gille" by the sister of Earl Sigurd, and that his name, as well as that of Earl Sigurd's son, was derived from the same common ancestor; nay, it is even probable that Somerled of the Isles, who seems to have been born about 1020, was immediately named after the Orkneyan earl who died about that time.

[a] [See Appendix, Nos. 56 and 57.]

NOTE 15, p. 60.—*Fundata est Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ Saviniensis.*

This is the Cistercian Abbey of Savigny in Normandy, from which that of Furness, the mother of Rushen Abbey, in Man, was founded. Even before the erection of Furness and Rushen, the monks of Savigny, in Normandy, seem to have had the right of furnishing Man with bishops, which right was subsequently transferred—first to Furness and then to Rushen.[a] We learn from Stubbs "*Acta Archiep. Eboracen.*, p. 1217, as well as from Mathew Paris, p. 60, and *Chron. Nordmann.*, in the collection of Duchesne, p. 986, that some years before 1114, Wimund, a monk of Savigny, and at the same time priest in the Isle of Skye, was ordained Bishop of Man by Archbishop Thomas of York, and that when he went away (we shall see afterwards that he became a pretender to the Scottish crown), John, a monk from the diocese of Seez (probably from the Abbey of Savigny), became his successor, being in his turn again succeeded by Nicholas a monk from Furness, as we learn from two letters directed by King Olave[b] to Archbishop Thurstan of York, preserved in the "White Book" at York, and printed in Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum.*[c]

[a] [The selection of two monks from the monastery of Savigny to fill the see of Man, does not prove that the monastery had any *right* to the nomination. The Order of Savigny was founded by Vitalis de Mortain in the forest of Fougeres, on the confines of Britany; but Raoul, the lord of the place, fearing they might disturb his game, gave them the remains of an old castle, and the adjoining forest of Savigny, near Avranches, in 1112. It was one of the most celebrated Orders in France before it was united or matriculated with Citeaux, under Serlo the fourth abbot, in 1148. The monks followed the rule of St. Benedict, and wore a habit of grey cloth, from which they were called grey monks. On being united with Citeaux they adopted the white dress of the Cistercian order, April 10, 1148. Eugenius IV., in a bull addressed to B. Serlo, numbers the abbey of Man, that is Rushen, among the dependencies of Savigny.—Bollandists, Oct. vol. viii., p. 1018.]

[b] [Professor Munch here mentions two letters from Olave, King of the Isles, and supposes both to have been written by the same person. This is incorrect; for the former was written by Olave I. in 1134, and the latter by Olave the son of Godred, and grandson to Olave I.—See Beck's *Antiquities of Furness*, 87.]

[c] See Dugdale, last edition, t. viii. 1186. We give the letters *in extenso*, as being of great interest to our present purpose. The year is wanting, as in most such ancient letters, but the mention of Furness only in the former, not of Rushen, shows that they are written before the erection of this monastery, probably about 1130. It seems to be only a mistake of the copyist, or perhaps the editor, that in the superscription Nicholas is called Bishop of Whitern (Candidæ Casæ) or Galloway.—[For the letters see Appendix, Nos. 3 and 4.]

NOTE 16, p. 60.—*Fund. Furness.*

This was the Abbey of Furness, in the diocese of York, mother to that of Rushen.[a]

NOTE 17, p. 60.—*Fund. Riuallis.*

This entry is taken from the *Chronica de Mailros*, but wrongly assigned to the year 1133; while the latter expressly states that the Abbey of Rivaux was founded in 1132, on a Saturday, which was also the III. non. Martii.

The eclipse, however, the mention of which is likewise verbatim adopted from the *Chronica de Mailros*, happened really on a Wednesday, the 2d of August, vide *L'art de verifier les dates.*[b] The monastery of Mailros was a daughter of Rivaux, thence the entry about the latter.

NOTE 18, p. 62.—*Eodem Anno—Rushen.*

There can be no doubt that among the privileges granted to the Abbey of Rushen was also that of furnishing bishops to the See of Man, although, as we shall see presently, this privilege was not compatible with the right asserted by the clergy and people of Man to elect the bishops themselves. When the Sudreys became a suffragan diocese under the metropolis of Nidaros in Norway, the same privilege became a matter of dispute between the Archbishops of Nidaros on one side and those of York with the monks of Furness and Rushen on the other.[c]

[a] [Furness is situated in Lancashire. The colony from Savigny, in Normandy, first settled at Tulbret, near Preston, an agreeable site, the gift of Stephen, Earl of Norton and Boulogne, and afterwards King of England, to Godfrey, abbot of Savigny. The colony under Evan or Ewan arrived on the 13th of July 1124, but after a stay of three years and three days they removed in July 1127 to Furness, into the valley of Beckangs-gill, or deadly nightshade, so called from that plant growing plentifully in the neighbourhood. This land was also the gift of Stephen. See the Charter, Appendix A, of vol. i. of Oliver's *Monumenta*. Like Savigny, Furness followed the rule of St. Benedict, until the time of the fifth abbot, Richard of Bayeux, when they adopted the rule of Citeaux, which had its rise in 1078. The monks of Furness objected to the change, and Peter of York, their abbot, went to Rome to plead against it, but on his return he was intercepted, stripped of his abbacy, and compelled to learn the new rule at Savigny. Richard was appointed to succeed him. Peter was afterwards made abbot at Areton, in the Isle of Wight.]

[b] Here, in the text, the *Chron. de Mailros* can be corrected by our Chronicle having the word "feria," which is omitted in the former, between "Augusti" and "iiij."

[c] [This is merely a conjecture of Professor Munch's, unsupported by the evi-

NOTE 19, p. 62.—*Fundata est Abb. S. M. de Malros, etc.*

The year here given for both entries,—that about the erection of the monastery and the other about the battle of the Standard (*i.e.*, of Northallerton), are both wrong.

The Abbey of Melrose was founded on the Easter Monday 1136, and the battle of Northallerton was fought on the 22d of August 1138.

NOTE 20, p. 62.—*Ob. S. Malachias.*

This is likewise wrong ; St. Malachy died A.D. 1148, vide *Chron. de Mailros*, and his biography, in the works of St. Bernard, ed. 1690, i. 657.

NOTE 21, p. 62.—*Fund. est Abbatia S. M. de Holme Coltran.*

Again the number of the year (1141) is wrong, the entry being taken *Chron. de Mailros*, where the erection of the Monastery of Holmcultran (in Cumberland) is mentioned to have taken place on the 1st of January 1150.

NOTE 22, p. 62.—*Godredus filius Olave transfretavit.*

That the year assigned to the death of King Olaf ought to be 1153, not 1142, is already shown above, and needs no further demonstration. Very likely, however, 1152 was the year in which Godred went to Norway, and 1153 that of his return, as there are two years expressly mentioned in the Chronicle, although indeed the death of King Olaf is recorded in both. Moreover, the fact that in the bull of 28th November 1154, by which Pope Anastasius IV., a few days before his death, at the suggestion of Nicholas Breakspear, Cardinal Bishop of Albano,[a]

dence referred to. The document, No. 19 in the Appendix, refers exclusively to the consecration, not to the election. The supposed right of the monastery of Rushen to furnish the bishop for Man is nowhere shown.]

[a] [Afterwards Pope Adrian IV., the only Englishman who ever sat on the throne of St. Peter. Dunham thus sets forth the circumstances of the visit of N. Breakspear, Cardinal of Albano, to Norway, which resulted in this bull of Anastasius IV. At the time of his visit three brothers, Sigurd, Inge, and Eystein, were contending for the throne ; and complaints, recriminations, quarrels, treachery, bloodshed, succeeded each other, when the arrival of the papal legate suspended for a time the sanguinary proceedings of these princes. His mission was two-fold—to restore peace between the unnatural brothers, and to establish an archbishopric. The Norwegian monarchs had long demanded a primate of

erected the Metropolitan See of Nidaros, in Norway, the bishopric of the Sudreys is expressly named as one of its Suffragans, puts it beyond doubt that the homage of Godred to King Inge must have been made immediately before, or during the stay of the aforesaid Cardinal in Norway from the 20th of July till about September 1152, when the previous arrangements about the erection of the See were made, it being rather unlikely that Man and the Sudreys, whose king so lately, as we have seen, had acknowledged the rights of the Archbishop of York, to consecrate the bishop thereof, could have been assigned to the province of Nidaros, unless upon such a palpable evidence of their allegiance to Norway, as that afforded by the personal presence and homage of Godred.[a]

their own instead of being dependent on the archbishops of Lund. In both objects he was successful. The three kings laid down their arms; united in showing the highest deference to the legate; and beheld with joy the creation of a metropolitan see at Trondheim, with a jurisdiction, not over Norway merely, but Iceland, Greenland, the Faroe Islands, the Shetlands, the Orkneys, the Hebrides, and Man. In return, the chiefs and people readily agreed to pay the tribute of Peter's pence. Many were the reforms which this well-meaning dignitary endeavoured to carry. He introduced more decorum into the public worship; he enjoined the clergy to attend more to their proper functions and to interfere less in secular matters; and impressed on the new archbishop the necessity of a rigorous control over the morals of his flock. In attempting to enforce clerical celibacy he did not meet with so ready an acquiescence, but no one dared openly to resist him. To another of his measures we must award a much higher meed of praise. Seeing that bloodshed had for many reigns stained the proceedings of the Lands-Thing, or provincial assembly, he prevailed on the chiefs to promise that they would not in future attend with arms. Even the king was only to be accompanied by twelve armed men—an exception conceded less to his dignity than to the necessity under which he lay of enforcing the judicial sentences. To an Englishman the conduct of Cardinal Albano on this mission is gratifying. It was no less esteemed by the Norwegians. "In several other respects," observes Snorro, "he reformed the customs and manners of the people during his stay; so that never did stranger come to the land more honoured or more beloved by the princes and their subjects."—See the bull of erection of the Archiepiscopal See of Nidaros, in Appendix No. 5.]

[a] [The ecclesiastical did not necessarily follow the political distribution of power; though, not unfrequently, the Pope altered the districts of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to meet the redistribution of states, resulting from conquest and other causes. It by no means follows that Olave recognised the supremacy of York over Man because he sent his bishop to that see for consecration. Oftentimes quasi legatine powers were given to particular archbishops, either for a time or for a specified purpose, without subjecting the diocese, in which power to act was given, to the perpetual jurisdiction of his Archiepiscopal See. The application above mentioned of Godred of Dublin to Lanfranc of Canterbury, supplies such an example.—(See Appendix, Nos. 1 and 2.) So also Pope Honorius III. directs the Archbishop of York to examine into and decide upon the petition of

What might have been the reasons which compelled Olaf, no doubt reluctantly, to send his son to Norway, and acknowledge the suzerainty of King Inge (here called Hinge) is difficult to say. Most likely it was the troubles caused by the above mentioned ex-bishop Wimund, in which, also, Somerled of Argyll took an active part. The pretensions to the Scottish Crown, asserted by the Moray dynasty, were inherited from Sulach by Angus Mac Heth, son of his daughter, and Earl of Moray, who rebelled against King David, but was killed in the battle of Strickathrow 1130.[a] Shortly afterwards, however, bishop Wimund declared himself to be the son of Angus, with the real name of Malcolm Mac Heth, assumed the title of Earl of Moray, and demanded even the crown of Scotland.[b] He found a great many followers; and, indeed, his pretensions seem to have been rather well founded; in the Orkney Saga he is absolutely called "Malcolm, Earl of Moray," without the least hint as to his being an impostor. The Melrose annals style him "Malcolm Mac Heth."[c] Somerled of Argyle gave him his daughter[d] in marriage, and subsequently the powerful Earl of Orkney, Harold, married his daughter.[e] Assisted by Somerled he ravaged for a time the western shores of Scotland, until King David succeeded in capturing and confining him in the castle of Roxburgh (1134). His sons, however, fled for refuge to Somerled, who revived the war after the death of David (1153). Meanwhile David seems to have taken his revenge with a strong hand; it is even said, we do not know upon what authority, that about 1135 he conquered the islands of Man, Arran, and Bute, which, however, cannot be right as far as regards Man, the fact being not mentioned in the Chronicle; so far, however, we may perhaps infer, that David threatened Man, so that Olaf found it advisable to put himself and his kingdom under the protection of the Norwegian kings. At the same time the powerful Welsh prince Cadwallader, who in 1142 was engaged in a fierce war with his brother Owen Gwynedd of Monmouth, seems to have infested Man; for, while Caradoc tells that he raised a great force of warriors from Ireland and Scotland (*i.e.* the Sudreys), the Orkneyinga Saga records, that "a Welsh chieftain" made great ravages in the Sudreys and Man,

a bishop of Man (Nicholas) to be relieved from his episcopal charge. See Oliver's *Monumenta*, ii. p. 67. And in 1244 Pope Innocent IV. arranges for the Archbishop of York to consecrate the bishops of Man, but with the consent of the Archbishop of Drontheim. See Appendix, No. 19.]

[a] *Chron. de Mailros.* Fordun, v. 42, viii. 2.

[b] Fordun, v. 51, cfr. viii. 2, 59. William of Newbury, i. 23, 24.

[c] *Chron. de Mailros*—a, 1134. *Orkneyinga Saga*, p. 404.

[d] [Skene says his sister.]

[e] [Skene says his sister.]

killing a wealthy and powerful lord, whose widow married the celebrated Orkneyan hero Svein Asleifsson.[a] All these troubles, perhaps even apprehensions, from the sons of his brother Harold, might have determined Olaf to acknowledge at last a suzerainty which he seems to have disclaimed for the greater part of his life.[b]

[a] [Sweyne, says Robertson, was a genuine type of the chieftain of that era, a veritable representative of that numerous class which viewed with such suspicious jealousy the curtailment of their lawless liberty, by the introduction of a novel system of government. The spring and autumn he dedicated to agriculture,—a scanty crop was rudely sown, and as rudely gathered in; the summer was devoted to a course of piracy; and the winter was spent in revelry. Such were still the habits of life amongst the chieftains of the North and West of Scotland; and in earlier times, as in Scandinavia and northern Germany, the practice had been similar throughout the whole country, with the sole difference that the dwellers upon the coasts were rovers by sea, and the inhabitants of the interior were plunderers by land. Sweyne lost his life in battle against the English, who admired his desperate courage, in an attempt to restore Asgal Mac Ragnal to Dublin.—Robertson, i. 408.]

[b] [It is hard to understand why Munch has mixed up the history of the attempts of the Mac Heth family against Scotland, with the acts of Somerled against Man and the Isles; for although the two families were connected by marriage, and had common cause against Scotland, yet there was nothing in common between them in regard to the Isle of Man. In fact the withdrawal of Somerled's retainers to support him in his claims on Man and the Isles, so far weakened the resources of the Mac Heths, that they were finally defeated, and lost their name and place in Scottish history; for the last time that the name of the ancient race of Moray appears in history is in the reign of Alexander II., when Kenneth Mac Heth was slain in an abortive rebellion, June 15, 1215. However, as Munch has made them a part of Manx history, and as Wimund, a Manx bishop, assumed their name and claims, it becomes imperative to give their history, in order that what is true may be separated from what is false, and that the acts of the real family of Mac Heth may be separated from those of Wimund the pretender; for Munch, in common with most writers, has confounded them. Robertson, however, has accurately drawn the line of distinction between the two. Heth, Mormaor, or Earl, of Moray, who, with his confederates, was defeated by Alexander I. on the Moray Firth, left two sons, Angus and Malcolm, who, through their mother, the daughter of Lulach, the successor of Macbeth, claimed to be of the line of Kenneth Macduff. In 1130 they rose in arms to assert their claim to the Scottish throne. David was absent in England; but Edward, the son of Siward, the Constable of Scotland, defeated them at Strickathrow, not far from the northern Esk. Their leader Angus, the Earl, or *King* of Moray, fell with four thousand of his men! Malcolm, his brother, escaped, and in 1134 gathered together the retainers and supporters of his family to renew his claims. David was seriously alarmed, and made vast preparations by land and sea to meet his rival. The rumour of these reached the Western chieftains, who, fearing for their island fastnesses, seized Malcolm and delivered him to David, by whom he was sent a prisoner to Roxburgh castle. It was this Malcolm, not the imposter Wimund, who had married a sister of Somerled Mac Gillebride, the ancestor of

NOTE 23, p. 66.—*Coepit regnare Godredus.*

From what is already remarked, it will be easily seen that the year 1144 is to be corrected into 1154. The chronicle itself assigns to Godred's reign the length of thirty-three years, and mentions afterwards, rightly, his death in 1187. The events in Dublin here narrated are not alluded to in the Irish annals, and as it is clearly indicated that Godred did not feel himself firmly seated on the throne, or exhibit any tyrannical tendencies, until after his return from Ireland, while the first naval battle which occurred afterwards with Somerled in the war caused by his tyranny, is stated to have been fought in 1156, it is evident that his war in Ireland cannot have taken place in the third year of his reign, as the Chronicle has it, unless this third year is to be reckoned from his homage to the Norwegian king in the year 1152.

the Lords of Argyll. In 1156, Donald, the son of Malcolm, endeavoured to renew the contest, but he was captured in Galloway, and sent to share his father's imprisonment. The captivity of his son bowed the spirit of the father, and he came to terms with Malcolm IV., by whom he was liberated in 1157. His name appears amongst the signatures in the chartulary of Dunfermline, where, with the leading nobles of the country, he was no doubt in attendance at the court of his youthful sovereign.

Wimund, bishop of Man and the Isles, sometime about 1151 assumed the name of Mac Heth, and boldly laid claim to the throne of Scotland. He was born of obscure parents, but acquired a good education, made his religious profession in the monastery of Furness, and was eventually appointed to the See of Man. His ready eloquence, jovial manner, and stalwart frame, captivated his barbarous flock, and enabled him to gather round him a bold and daring army, composed of the adherents of the Mormaor of Moray, and the wild men of the Isles, ever ready for a foray into the richer lands of their neighbours. At their head he harried the provinces of Scotland, with bloodshed and rapine, and when menaced by the royal forces retired into his wooded fastnesses or island inlets, but only to sally forth with greater boldness when the army had retired. Baffled by the craft and insolence of his enemy, and fearing for the security of his north-western provinces, David brought him to terms by the offer of a principality in Furness. In this new acquisition he abated nothing of his pride and pomp, but travelled through the country like a prince, at the head of his army. Wearied by his exactions, and disgusted with his pretensions, he was seized by the people, not without the connivance of their leaders, and was blinded and mutilated, in which state he passed many years in tranquillity in the abbey of Byland, where he was accustomed to boast that had his enemies left him but the eyelight of a sparrow he would have given them cause to repent of what they had done.—William of Newburgh, vol. i. chap. 23-4; Skene's *Highlanders of Scotland*, vol. ii. pp. 165-7; Robertson, i. 219-224.]

NOTE 24, p. 68.—*Commissum est navale prœlium, etc.*

To understand these affairs thoroughly, we subjoin the following *exposé*. Malcolm Mac Heth being, as we have told above, taken prisoner in 1134, and confined in the castle of Roxburgh, where also his son Donald was put in 1156, he was, nevertheless, released by King Malcolm, who even ceded to him some possessions in Cumberland, evidently fearing his father-in-law, the powerful Somerled. Malcolm Mac Heth, however, exercised such a tyranny towards his subjects, that they revolted, took him prisoner, put his eyes out, besides inflicted other mutilations, and confined him in the monastery of Bellaland[a] in Yorkshire, compelling him to resume the cowl. Nevertheless Somerled continued to make war against the Scottish king, as well as against Godred, who consequently, having enemies in common with the former, could not avoid coming into friendly relations towards him. Immediately, therefore, after his flight from Man, we find him at the court of King Malcolm, where he witnessed the confirmation of a document in 1159 (Anderson, *Dipl. Scot.*, No. 25) ; in the next year we find him at the court of King Inge in Norway, who seems to have confirmed him in his royal rights, as it is said in the Icelandic annals that in 1160 he got the title of King of the Sudreys. During his stay with King Inge he took a conspicuous part in the battle upon the ice near Oslo, on the 4th of February 1164, where Inge was killed ; he commanded even a wing of Inge's army, but declared treacherously for the enemy, King Hácon, and thereby might be said to have been the chief cause of Inge's death. His treason, however, did certainly not bring him the expected fruits, because King Hácon, who no doubt had promised him his assistance, was slain by the partizans of the deceased king the following year, and the victorious party came again in power under their new King Magnus Erlingsson. This party, however, either could not or would not give Godred any assistance, at least not till 1164, when Magnus, being more firmly established on the throne, and crowned (in the month of September), had probably taken Godred into grace and received his homage ; for till this time it appears that Godred remained in Norway, abandoning his kingdom entirely to Somerled, nor is it likely that he would have returned even then, if he had not received the welcome news that Somerled was killed in the battle at Renfrew. The division which is said to have been made in 1156 between Godred and Somerled, and to have caused the ruin of the kingdom, ought perhaps

[a] [Biland.]

more properly to be said to have been effected between Godred and Dubhgal or Dugald, the son of Somerled. The islands allotted to Dugald, through this division, were no doubt those which lay nearer to Argyle, and of which, indeed, we find afterwards the descendants of Dugald in possession.[a]

NOTE 25, p. 70.—*Eodem tempore, etc.*

The Saint here called Machutus, is now generally called St. Maughold or Magharde; even in the legend here narrated he is once called Machaldus.

NOTE 26, p. 74.—*Sumerledus—Rinfriu.*

The same tale is told by Fordun and in the *Chronica de Mailros*, so that there cannot be any doubt of its being true, although the Orkney Saga makes Swein Asleifsson kill Somerled in 1159. This, however, must be a complete mistake. Fordun even adds the day on which the battle took place, viz., the 1st of January; and the name of his son, Gillecolum. The entry in our Chronicle is an abridgment from that in *Chron. de Mailros*, where it is expressly stated that Somerled had rebelled against King Malcolm for twelve years. By a mistake, however, the death of King Malcolm is mentioned in the same year; Malcolm died in 1165 (December 9)—and perhaps this number ought to be inserted before "eodem anno." Likewise the entry about the comets, taken from *Chron. de Mailros*, belongs to A.D. 1165, not to 1166.[b]

[a] [The real injury done by Somerled to Man was not so much the possession of the Sudreys, as the interposition of an independent sovereignty between Man and the Northern Hebrides, which thereby weakened its hold on that distant dependency. Though the descendants of Somerled held their possessions in Argyll as feifs of the Scottish crown, they continued to hold the Isles as feudatories of the crown of Norway.]

[b] [After the liberation of Malcolm Mac Heth from Roxburgh castle, Somerled seems to have made his peace with the King of Scotland, but for some unknown cause he again broke out in open rebellion in 1164, landing suddenly on the coast of Renfrew with the whole force of Argyll and the Isles, strengthened by a body of auxiliaries from Ireland. Tradition says that he fell by treachery, together with his son Gillecolum. His followers dispersed on the death of their leader. Thus perished in an obscure skirmish the mighty chieftain of the Oirir Gael or Scottish Scandinavians of the coast, who built up the house of the Lords of Lorn and Argyll on the ruins of the ancient kingdom of the Gall, Gael, or Scandinavian and Gaelic population of the Isles, formerly centered in Man. Burton says that Somerled himself was reputed to be of Celtic origin. The Celtic language prevailed both in Man and the Isles, and on the north-west of the mainland of Scotland.—Burton, i. 215-6, ii. 103. Robertson, i. 359.]

Whence Godred got the "*magna multitudo armatorum*," which he brought from Norway in 1164, is difficult to say. It is not likely that King Magnus, or rather the father and governor of King Magnus, Erling Skakke, would or could afford to give him much. But the rebellion of "Sigurd Markusfóstri" was just put down in Norway, and his troop, consisting chiefly of wild and reckless warriors from the southern borders of Norway, was without employment. Maybe Godred engaged some of these fellows. It is even probable that this was the occasion which brought the Husbac or Uspak (grandson of Somerled) mentioned p. 92, to Norway; it being evident that in the year 1230, when he was sent to the Sudreys as king, he was very old, while the circumstance of his real birth being for so long unknown or concealed, shows that he must have been carried away from the Isles while yet a child, no doubt by some of the above mentioned warriors, when they went back to Norway, where they must be supposed, all of them who returned, to have joined the party of the Birkibeins, to which Uspak is expressly stated to have belonged.

NOTE 27, p. 76.—*Anno* MCLXXI. *Henricus rex, etc.*

The year should be 1170, as in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, from which this entry is taken. Our text, however, is in so far more correct than that of the M. Chronicle, as it does not make the coronation-day of young Henry the same as the consecration-day, which is the case in *Chron. de Melrose*, where the words run thus: "*Henricus rex Angliæ fecit coronari Henricum puerum, et in regem apud Lundonias, xi. kalendas Junii in die dominica consecrari a Rogero*," [a] etc. In 1170, the 22d of May was not a Sunday, but a Friday.[b]

NOTE 28, p. 76.—*Vivianus, etc.*

This Vivian, Cardinal-priest of St. Stephen, in Monte Coelio, is mentioned in several chronicles. The *Chronicle of Melrose* mentions his arrival in Scotland in the year 1176, saying of him "conculcans et comminuens omnia quæque, expeditus capere nec impeditus rapere,"—and states, that returning from Ireland in 1177, he held a council of the Scotch prelates at Edinburgh. See moreover Roger Hoveden (Savile, p. 553), and Bromton (Twysden, p. 110), where it is expressly stated

[a] [*Henry, King of England, had his son Henry, yet a boy, crowned and consecrated king, at London, on Sunday the 22d of May.*]

[b] [Lingard says that he was crowned on Sunday, June 14, 1170.—ii. 153.]

that he was sent to visit not only Scotland, Ireland, and the Isles, but also Norway; to which country, however, he never came. Bromton says that he landed in England the 22d of June 1176, without the consent of the king; who, therefore, would not allow him to go farther till he had sworn not to do anything against him; having complied with the request he got letters of safe conduct to Scotland, whence, about Christmas, he visited Man, where he staid a fortnight, continuing his journey to Ireland, where he encouraged the inhabitants of Downshire to hold out against John de Courcy. Afterwards, therefore, as a punishment, he was put into prison by John, but released after a short while, held a council at Dublin, and returned to Scotland, where he is said to have created so great dissatisfaction by his avarice that the Pope was obliged to recall him.[a]

NOTE 29, p. 76.—*Anno* MCLXXII.

Again the number of the year is wrong, this being evidently 1182. Neither the Reginald here spoken of, nor the "Fogolt" *Vicecomes Manniæ*, named in the next entry, are mentioned anywhere else. This is the first time that the title "*Vice-Comes*" occurs in the Chronicle, and it is very uncertain what the Norwegian term was for this denomination. In 1223 a "*vicecomes de Sky*" is mentioned, whence it would seem that each of the greater islands had a "*Vicecomes*" or governor. Very likely the title existed since the times of Earls Sigurd, and Thorfinn of Orkney, when the Isles were subjected to these earls, and their substitutes who commanded in their names really did so "vice Comitum." In the times, however, of King Godred, the substitute governors ought rather to be called viceroys. Perhaps the Norwegians only called these functionaries *sýslumenn* (which in Latin is always rendered by *ballivi*).

NOTE 30, p. 78.—*Olavi—utpote decennis pueri.*

As it is expressly stated that Olaf was three years old in 1176, when the solemn wedding took place between his father and mother, he must have attained his 14th, not only his 10th year, at his father's death. From the supplementary narrative, p. 82, we learn that Reginald, if not immediately at his accession, at least sometime after-

[a] [Cardinal Vivian Tomasi had been appointed by Pope Alexander III. to settle the dispute raised at the council of Northampton, under Cardinal Petrileone, about the claims of the Archbishop of York to supremacy over Glasgow.—Burton, ii. 74.]

wards, assigned to Olaf the island of Lewis for maintenance. Very likely he gave him in exchange for the royal power the same appanage, or fief, which he had himself hitherto obtained. In the Icelandic Saga of the celebrated chief and physician Rafn Sveinbiarnarson it is told rather at length, how this Rafn and the bishop-elect Gudmund, sailed from Iceland towards Norway in the year 1202, were driven by storms to Sandey, one of the Sudreys, where they happened to find King Olaf and the bishop, and were compelled by the former to pay a tax, at first calculated at fifty marks, but afterwards, as the Icelanders showed fight, abated to fifteen marks.[a] Sandey being no doubt Sandera, one of the southernmost of the long series of islands called Long Island, beginning with Lewis, it is evident that Olaf did not get this island only, but also the others, North-Uist, Harris, South-Uist, Benbecula, etc.,—down to the southernmost point. Reginald, the elder brother, was, according to the Orkney Saga, regarded as one of the most warlike princes in the western parts of Europe at his time; once, it is stated, he passed three entire successive years in the manner of the ancient sea-kings, always on board his ship, never during the whole period for one single hour living beneath the roof of a house. Our Chronicle entirely omits his participation in the Orkneyan affairs, which however is spoken of by Roger Hoveden under the year 1196; and the whole narrative of Hoveden, of these events, is again copied by the writer of our Chronicle in a separate article, bound up in the same MS. vol.[b] It is to be observed that Hoveden mentions under one year what really took place in three or four. We shall here briefly enumerate the events in the connexion which appears to be just, after duly comparing the Orkney Saga, the Melrose Chronicle, and Fordun.[c] The powerful Orkneyan earl, Harold son of Madadh, Earl of Atholl, had for a long period been on bad terms with King William of Scotland. It is very probable that Harold was one of the six earls who rebelled against King Malcolm in 1160, in order to place William of Egremont, grandson of Duncan, on the throne; and that he also supported the son of William, Donald Bane, who aspired to the

[a] Saga Hrafns Sveinbjarnarsonar, Biskupa Sögur, Copenhagen, 1858, p. 563-564.

[b] See Johnstone's *Antiquitates Celto Normannicæ*, p. 49, sqq., where it is printed. [Also Oliver's *Mon.* vol. i. p. 37.]

[c] We deem it superfluous here to enter into a minute *compte rendu* of all the reasons which have induced us to give now one, now another, author the preference, when conflicting with each other. Indeed, the reasons present themselves obviously. Those, however, who want to see them scrupulously explained, we refer to our work, *The History of the Norwegian People*, vol. iii. pp. 41, 289, 443-454.

throne, and from 1180-1187 maintained himself in Moray and Ross, till he was killed in the battle of Macgarvey (July 31, 1187). It is expressly stated that Harold was instigated to hostilities against the Scottish king by his second wife Hoarflad (Gormlath), daughter of the above mentioned Malcolm Mac Heth, Earl of Moray, *alias* bishop Wimund. When, therefore, a rival to the earldoms of Orkney and Caithness appeared in the person of Harold the younger (grandson by a daughter of Earl Ragnvald), who had got the title of earl from the Norwegian king about 1175, King William embraced his interests, and gave him the half of Caithness, which of course he must have taken from Harold the elder; and although it is not said expressly, yet we may safely infer, that from this time incessant or frequent feuds raged between the two rivals. Harold the elder being a staunch partizan of the Norwegian king Magnus, who was supplanted and at last killed in battle by the celebrated *Sverrir* (1184), it is evident that Harold the younger must have looked for support to the latter, and declared for him, and this was no doubt the principal reason why Harold the elder in 1193 permitted the enemies of Sverrir to collect troops and ships in his dominions, and even afforded them considerable support.[a] This force made great mischief in Norway, but was at last totally vanquished by Sverrir in a bloody battle near Bergen (April 3, 1194). And now Earl Harold was severely punished. He was summoned to Norway, and there compelled to submit to the terms dictated by King Sverrir, who entirely detached Shetland from the earldom, annexing it to the crown, and moreover appropriated to himself a great part of the revenues of Orkney. It would even seem that Sverrir, if not immediately, yet shortly afterwards, assigned to his rival the half of Orkney, due to him as the grandson and heir of Earl Ragnvald. Yet though humiliated in this manner, and stripped of a great part of his dominions, Harold the elder, nevertheless, according to Hoveden, dared to occupy Moray, or perhaps rather to keep it in his possession, the occupation having probably taken place before 1195. Profiting, it would seem, by his present distress, King William made an expedition to Moray, nor did Harold venture to resist him, but fled to his ships, while King William penetrated as far as Thurso in Caithness, where he destroyed the earl's palace. Harold, prevented by storms from crossing over to

[a] [These were Olave, Harold's brother-in-law, and John Halkelson, who sailed from the Orkneys to assist the son of the Norwegian regent, Erling, in placing Sigurd Magnusson upon his father's throne. The flower of the Orkneys assembled round the banner of Olave, perished with their two leaders, in the disastrous battle of Floravagr.—Robertson, i. 432.]

Orkney, felt compelled to submit to King William as he had submitted to King Sverrir; but he obtained his forgiveness, and was even permitted to retain the half of Caithness by promising, upon oath, that next time, when the king came to Moray, he should deliver up to him all his enemies,—no doubt the Mac Williams, and give his own son Thorfinn as hostage. As soon, however, as the king had returned, the peace was broken by Harold himself or his men, who penetrated as far as Inverness, before they were routed by the royal forces. King William now went back to the north, and overran Sutherland, Caithness, and Moray, while Harold, as it would seem, frightened, and professing to be innocent of the doings of his son, met the king at Lochloy, near Nairn, bringing the enemies, as stipulated, but for hostages only his two young nephews, not Thorfinn. And even before seeing the king he suffered the enemies to escape, apologising afterwards to the king in a manner which only tended to exasperate him the more. No wonder Harold was severely punished; the king declared him a felon and breaker of the treaty, to have forfeited what he still held of Caithness, carried him away as prisoner, and had him confined in the castle of Roxburgh, until his son Thorfinn should be delivered up. This was accordingly done, and Harold being exchanged for his son, returned to Orkney, where, however, he was soon visited with new troubles, as his rival, Harold the younger, just coming from Norway with some forces collected there, requested him to give up the half of Orkney, and this being denied, attacked him so suddenly and fiercely that he fled to Man, there to seek for help. Harold the younger, however, followed him, but did not find him at Man, as he had already returned to Scotland, with some auxiliary forces. Harold the younger now also returned to Scotland and waited for his rival at Wick. Nor was it long before Harold the elder appeared, but with a force much larger than expected; a battle ensued, in which the younger earl and his men were killed, after having given proofs of the most heroical valour (1198). Harold the elder now recaptured Caithness, and as he could excuse himself as being this time the attacked party, he ventured even to repair to the court of King William, requesting to retain the possession of Caithness for a large sum of money. The king showed himself not indisposed to grant the request, but demanded farther, that Harold should dismiss his wife, the daughter of Malcolm Mac Heth. With this condition, however, Harold could or would not comply, and the negotiations were broken off. King William now addressed himself to King Reginald of Man, offering him the earldom of Caithness for a certain sum

of money, and payment of the regular tribute.[a] Reginald accepted the offer, and collected troops, being also supplied with auxiliary forces from Ireland by his brother-in-law, John of Courcy; with this army he went to Caithness, and conquered it without any resistance on the part of Harold. In the beginning of the winter, however, he returned home, leaving three lieutenants to defend the conquest; but Harold, profiting by his absence, caused one of the lieutenants to be put to death by an assassin, and shortly after landed himself at Thurso with a powerful fleet, with the intention to retake his ancestral patrimony. He began with attacking and storming the episcopal palace of Scrabustar (Skarabólstaðr where bishop John of Caithness just happened to be; and considering this prelate as the principal instigator of the hostilities which he had encountered from the Scotch king, he took a most barbarous revenge, ordering him to be blinded and his tongue to be cut out. This done, he made himself master of the whole of Caithness, severely punishing all adherents of King William, and seizing the possessions of those who fled to save themselves. The King of the Isles, it would seem, now entirely gave up the idea, or lost the desire, of becoming Lord of Caithness, as the above mentioned lieutenants did not betake themselves to him, but to King William, who henceforth sought revenge and punished the wilful earl in his own name. His first act was to let the unhappy Thorfinn, the earl's son, who still remained as hostage, atone for the trespasses of his father; he was blinded and castrated, and shortly afterwards died in prison. In the spring of 1202, King William with a large force went to the North, and encamped at Esteyndale, which then formed the border between Sutherland and Caithness, preparing an expedition across the Pentland Firth to Orkney. The earl, seeing the superior strength of his suzerain, and despairing of success, again sued for peace, which he obtained, as well as the possession of Caithness, on the condition of paying every fourth penny found in the whole earldom, no doubt as an indemnification to King Reginald of Man, who had paid his money without getting the object. Harold, being unable to procure the money from his own means, induced the inhabitants of Caithness, who were anxious themselves to avoid the horrors of war, to pay what was wanted, and thus a sum of 2000 marks in silver was raised, with which the king was satisfied.[b] Thus Earl

[a] [Tytler, in his *History of Scotland*, mentions this purchase of Caithness from William, and makes a special exception of the yearly tribute due to the king. Vide also Ayliff's *Calendar of Ancient Charters*, p. 336.]

[b] [Robertson says 2000 pounds of silver. At Harold's death, in 1206, his three sons succeeded to his inheritance, Heinrek to Ross, David and John to his

Harold retained Caithness at the cost of the inhabitants, and it does not appear that King Reginald afterwards aspired to the possession of this remote district.[a]

NOTE 31, p. 84.—*Fuitque Olavus catenatus in carcere regis Scotiæ fere septem annis, etc.*

As King William died in 1214, December 4, the time when King Olaf was taken prisoner and sent to William must have been in the course of the year 1208.[b] It is therefore very likely that an expedition, undertaken from Norway to the Isles in 1210, on which point our Chronicle is entirely silent, but of which the king's Saga and the Icelandic annals speak, was partly prompted by the friends and adherents of Olaf, who had now only to look towards Norway for assistance and revenge, Scotland being the accomplice of Reginald. Again, however, the Norwegian and Icelandic relations make no mention at all of the treacherous conduct of King Reginald. The Saga only tells,[c] that when the long civil war between the two political factions, the Birkibeins and the Beglings, was happily brought to an end through the treaty of Hvitingsey, in the summer of 1208, several of the warriors on both sides, disgusted with the prospects of peace and tranquillity at home, determined jointly to make a privateering expedition to the Sudreys. The pretext they could or did give for thus attacking a dependency of Norway in the times of peace, is not told: we are therefore left to conjecture; and, indeed, nothing is more probable than that the chief or pretended object was the chastisement of Reginald, and if

possessions in Caithness and Ross, which they divided between them, and upon the death of David, John succeeded to both earldoms.—Robertson, i. 413, 432.]

[a] Fordun, i. p. 512. Roger Hoveden (ap. Savile), p. 767. Orkneyinga Saga, p. 406-418. Sverr. Saga, ch. 125. Fordun (viii. 62) says that the mutilation of the bishop was not so thoroughly executed as the earl ordered, and that, consequently, the bishop retained the power of speaking and the sight of one eye. This is also more probable than the relation of Orkneyinga Saga, which says that the bishop was really deprived of his tongue and sight, but got them both back by a miracle of Sta. Triduana (in the Saga the name is corrupted into *Trollhæna*) to whom he offered his prayers. In the letter directed by Pope Innocent III. to the bishop of Orkney (dated Subiaco, September 1, 1202), in which he prescribes the penitence to be undergone by the man who had executed the cruel commands of the earl, there is only mention of the mutilation of the tongue, not of the eyes.—[Burton, ii. 83. Robertson, i. 413, n.]

[b] [Under date 1208 Johnstone says that Olave was carried to Marchemont castle, and was kept in durance till the death of William in 1214. Robertson says that he was confined in Roxburgh castle.—ii. 99. The Latin is *Castellum puellarum*, which, in the sixteenth century, was the name of Edinburgh castle.]

[c] Saga of King Inge, etc. Fornmanna Sögur, ix. 192.

possible the deliverance of Olaf. In the year 1209, according to the annals, the preparations were made, and twelve ships of war were armed. Among the chiefs are four expressly named as belonging to the party of the Beglings, and three as being Birkibeins; one of these was Uspak, the above mentioned grandson of Somerled, who perhaps intended to try if he could regain some possessions in right of his descent, and who no doubt was the real director of the whole concern. In the year 1209, as we learn from the Ulster annals, the "Mac Somerleds," *i.e.*, the sons of Reginald, son of Somerled, fought a battle with the men of Skye; this event also must somehow have been in connexion with the expedition from Norway, which, according to the annals, took place in 1210, or perhaps began in the autumn of 1209,[a] ending in 1210. In the saga no more is told of the expedition than that the Norwegians rifled Iona, which had till then been held sacred and left untouched;[b] that afterwards they quarrelled with each other, and separated; that some of them were killed in different places, and that those who returned were reprimanded severally by the bishops for having conducted themselves like pirates. It is very singular, and almost inconceivable, that our Chronicle should not say a word of this expedition. It is, however, not unlikely that the fact mentioned under the year 1210, viz., that Angus, the son of Somerled, being killed, with his three sons, is connected therewith, and that he fell in a fight with the Norwegians under his nephew Uspak. It is also probable that the Norwegians somehow took part in the devastation of Man by King John of England, of which our Chronicle speaks as happening in the same year (1210). Although the Saga speaks of the expedition from Norway as being of no consequence, yet it seems that it inspired Reginald with a wholesome awe of the Norwegians, which induced him shortly afterwards to repair to Norway with his son Godred, do homage to King Inge, swear the oath of allegiance, and pay the tribute hitherto withheld. All which, however, did not prevent him shortly afterwards, in 1212, doing homage also to King John of England (see his letter dated Lambeth, May 16, 1212, in Rymer, *Foedera*, i. p. 105),[c] though suffering his subjects to commit depredations on the coasts of Ireland and England. But after the death of King John, when his son, King Henry III., was at last established on the throne, and his rival, Louis of France, had left the kingdom, Reginald applied for a safe-conduct for the

[a] [Under 1210 Johnstone notes that the Icelandic annals record the pillage of Iona, and the consecration of Coll, Bishop of the Sudreys, after a vacancy of forty years from the death of Nemar.]

[b] [See Appendix, No. 6.]

[c] [See Appendix, No. 7.]

time, from January 16th to Easter 1218, that he might repair to King Henry, do him homage, and give satisfaction for the committed outrages. The letter was accorded (vide Rymer, *Foedera*, i. p. 150),[a] yet it is not said whether Reginald went then to London or not. Certain it is, however, that he did so the following year ;[b] and then not only offered his services and homage to the king, but also, summoned by the apostolical legate and plenipotentiary Pandolfo, issued a declaration dated Sept. 22, 1219, in which he professed to hold the Isle of Man as a fief of the Papal See, promised to pay a yearly tribute of twelve marks sterling, and acknowleged being invested by the Legate with the possession thereof.[c] This curious document, which certainly was in open contradiction with his obligations to Norway, and therefore evidently shows that he refused to acknowledge the suzerainty of the young Norwegian King Hácon (especially as it is expressly said in the document that the Isle of Man did belong to himself with hereditary right, and without any obligation of feudal service to anybody)—is not only preserved in the English archives, and printed in Rymer, *Foedera*, i. 1, 156 ; but from another copy, formerly existing in the papal archives, it has also been transcribed in the celebrated collection of documents recording the rights of the Holy See, which was compiled by Cardinal Nicholas of Aragon, and from this compilation again it is given by Raynaldus in the *Annales Eccl., ad anno* 1219, No. 44. Raynaldus gives also,[d] for the year 1223 (No. 53), a papal letter dated May 23, 1223, in which the holy Father accepts

[a] [See Appendix, No. 9.] [b] [See Appendix, No. 10.]

[c] [See Appendix, No. 8. This document, and No. 13, are here given by Munch as footnotes.

[d] [See Appendix, No. 13. The principal object of this act was to protect the kingdom against attacks from his more powerful neighbours, until their claims had been examined by Rome. It is not a solitary instance in the history of those times, as we see from the cases of Peter of Arragon, of our own King John, and others ; nor would it appear in the same light to the people of that day in which it does to us. For the feudal notions on graduated jurisdiction and corresponding subordination, easily led men to look upon that suzerainty as paramount which, as spiritual, was highest in order ; which, as an immediate delegation from Christ, was most directly derived from God ; and which was the most extensive, as embracing the holders of all other sovereignties in its jurisdiction. Hence, according to the political jurisprudence of the middle ages, we find the Popes not only the supreme judges in matters of faith and morals, but also the recognised arbitrators between other sovereigns, on matters within the sphere of the jurisdiction of those sovereigns, and enforcing their decisions not only by spiritual sanctions, but also by the temporal power of the sovereigns belonging to the Christian community. History, through many centuries, testifies to the powerful efficacy of this influence of the papal see in the preservation of peace, the protection of the weak, and the enforcement of justice. We see a curious application of the power of this influence in the sanction of the conventions between Norway and Scotland in 1266. (See

of the offer made by Reginald, and takes him and his realm into his protection. As for the homage of Reginald offered to the English king, it may be, however, that it was not meant for Man, but for some Irish fiefs, held by him on the condition to guard the coasts and seas against pirates and enemies; because, on the 24th September 1219, the king directed a letter to the Justiciary and Barons of Ireland for the protection of Reginald (Rymer, i. 1, p. 157); and from letters, likewise given by Rymer, we learn that such fiefs were really given to and accepted by his brother and successor Olaf, without in the least affecting his fidelity to the crown of Norway.[a] This also explains best the above mentioned words in the Orkney Saga, that Reginald passed three years in the manner of the ancient pirates, not sleeping beneath the roof of a house.

Appendix, No. 27). Another example of a different character may be found in the answer of Pope Pius II. to Thomas Stanley, Lord of Man. (Appendix, No. 53.)]

[a] [As the question raised about the political dependency of Man on England or Norway, is not unimportant, it will be well to refer to several documents published by Dr. Oliver, which, if they have not escaped the researches of Munch, have not received from him the attention due to their importance. February 7, 1205, King John takes Reginald, his lands and people, under his protection; *Mon.* ii. 25. February 7, 1206, John gives to Reginald a safe-conduct to England for fifteen days; *Ib.* 26. April 28, 1206, John orders the sheriff of Lancaster to assign to the King of Man thirty marcates of land in his bailiwick; *Ib.* 27. April 29, 1206, John orders his treasurer to pay to the King of Man thirty marks; *Ib.* 28. June 17, 1207, John orders the sheriff of Lancaster to assign to Reginald twenty litrates of land in his bailiwick; *Ib.* 29. On Trinity Sunday, 1212, ten marks were paid by John to Stephen of Oxford, for conducting the King of Man back to his own country; *Ib.* 30. May 16, 1212, Reginald acknowledges himself liegeman of John, referred to by Munch, p. 185; *Ib.* 31. May 16, 1213, John ordered some prisoners, subjects of Reginald, at Porchester and Dover, to be surrendered to the King of Man; *Ib.* 33. May 16, 1213, John orders his officers in Ireland to assist Reginald against the Norwegian sea-rovers; *Ib.* 34. At the same time, in return for his homage and service, he grants him a knight's fee in Ireland, and 100 measures of corn yearly; *Ib.* 35. January 3, 1214, John forbids his mariners of Ireland, etc., to injure the territory of the King of Man; *Ib.* 37. January 16, 1218, Henry III. signified that he had granted letters of safe-conduct to the King of the Isles, that he might render him homage, and amend certain excesses committed by his people against England and Ireland; *Ib.* 40. This is referred to by Munch, p. 185. September 24, 1219, Henry III. notifies that he had granted safe conduct to Reginald and his men to return home; that he had done homage, and that they might go safely to transact business in the island. He ordered also two hogsheads of wine, and 120 crannocks of corn, as a fee of one knight, with appurtenances in Ireland, to be given yearly to Reginald; *Ib.* 43, 45, 47. November 4, 1220, Henry III notifies to his justices of Ireland that they must protect Reginald against the King of Norway, who is dealing craftily with him, and demands from him undue tribute; and that they must see to his receiving the wine and corn promised unto him, and the knight's fee in

NOTE 32, p. 86.—*Scristinam filiam Ferkkar Comitis de Ros.*

"*Scristinam*" means "*Christinam*," as p. 22 "Gillescrist" is written instead of "Gillechrist." This "Ferkkar" was the powerful Ferquhard Mac Intagart,[a] Earl of Ross, whom the *Chron. de Mailros* calls "*Machentagar*," only narrating that in the year 1215 "[b] *intraverunt in Moraviam hostes domini regis Scotiæ, scilicet Dovenaldus Ban, filius Macwillelmi, et Kennauh Mac Aht, et filius cuiusdam regis Hiberniæ, cum turba malignantium copiosa; in quos irruens Machentagar hostes regis valide prostravit, quorum capita detruncavit et novo regi nova munera præsentavit, .xvii. kal. Julii, propter quod domnus rex novum militem ipsum ordinavit.*" The "Macwilliam"[c] here mentioned must have been the son of Guthred Macwilliam (son of William of Egremont, grandson of King Duncan and Ingibiörg the daughter of Finn Arneson), who had begun a rebellion in 1211, but in 1212 had been captured by William Cumyn, Earl of

Ireland; *Ib.* 58, 60. Surely these relations between the two kings imply something more than would arise from the tenure of a knight's fee! On the 12th of April 1228, Henry III. grants letters of safe conduct to Olave to come to England, for the framing of peace between himself and his brother Reginald; in 1250, to Harold, to come and perform what is due; and in 1255, to Magnus, for as long as he remains faithful; *Ib.* 69, 83, 86.]

[a] [Ferquhard Mac-in Tagart (the son of the priest), was probably descended from one of the Culdee abbots, who became mere lay proprietors of the abbey lands, discharging no ecclesiastical functions whatsoever, but supporting from their revenues the community by whom such duties were discharged. Ferquhard is the first member of his family known as Earl of Ross. This family afterwards rose to importance on the decline of the earls of Orkney. They held Skye and the Nordreys by grant from the Scottish kings, and were inveterate opponents of the little Norwegian population of the islands, who claimed to hold the islands as fiefs from the King of Norway. The fidelity of Ferquhard to the Scottish crown appears to have been rewarded by large grants in Argyll.—Robertson, i. 239; ii. 3, 23, 100.]

[b] [*Moravia (Moray) was invaded by Donald Bane, son of Mac William and Kennaught Mac Aht (Kenneth Mac Heth), and the son of an Irish king, with a numerous rabble of marauders, all of whom were at feud with the King of Scotland. Machentagar having attacked and sorely routed these enemies of the king, beheaded them, and presented their heads as a novel offering to the new king, on the 15th of June; in return for this service, the king created him a new knight.*]

[c] [The first Donald Bane or Mac William, who rebelled against William the Lion in 1181, was a son of William Fitz-Duncan, or grandson of Duncan, and cousin to the king. He was slain on Mamgarry Moor, near Inverness, in 1187. Godfrey, son of the preceding Mac William, or Donald Bane, rebelled against King William in 1211, and was beheaded in 1212, as stated by Munch. The Mac William or Donald Bane who rebelled against Alexander II. in 1215, and who was slain by Ferquhard, was brother, not son of Guthred or Godfrey.—Robertson, i. 393, 428; ii. 3.]

Buchan, and put to death (Fordun, viii, 76). "Kennauh Mac Aht," must mean "Kenneth Mac Heath," which shows him to have been son of the other pretender, Malcolm Mac Heth (alias Wimund), and brother-in-law of Earl Harold at Orkney.

NOTE 33, p. 86.—*Pol filius Boke.*

This is the *Páll Bálkason* thus named in the Saga of King Hácon, ch. 166. His father's name, *Bálki*, was pronounced, it would seem, by the Sudreyans, as it would still be in many parts of Norway, with omission of the "l," or in a manner analogous with the English pronunciation of "walk," "talk," etc. By a curious mistake, Johnstone (p. 150) believes the "*princeps Paulus*," mentioned p. 68, about the year 1154, to be the same as Páll Bálkason, who must in that case have been 100 years or more of age, when he came to Norway in 1229.

NOTE 34, p. 88.—*Alano domino Galwediæ.*

This is the celebrated Alan of Galloway, Constable of Scotland, and the most powerful of the Scotch magnates, married to the king's cousin Margaret of Huntingdon, and possessing large fiefs in Ireland, which he held from King John of England. His brother Thomas, who had become Earl of Atholl through marriage, is mentioned in our Chronicle as "*Thomas Comes Etholice*" in the year 1228.[a]

[a] [Thomas of Galloway, here called Earl of Athole, was the natural son of Alan, not his brother. On the death of his father, without legitimate male issue, he endeavoured to occupy Galloway, aided by Gilroy and a band of Irish adventurers; but he was defeated, and delivered into the custody of John Baliol, who had married Dervorguil, one of his father's daughters, and languished for upwards of fifty years in the dungeons of Bernard castle. The chronicler has not over-stated the atrocities of the wild Picts of Galloway, for whilst the Scots generally were branded as a blasphemous and unholy people, given to sacrilege, sparing neither churches nor monasteries in their conflagrations, nor women nor children in their slaughters, the palm of barbarity was given to the men of Galloway. Though Christians, they had retained many of the vices and some of the practices of their pagan forefathers. This very Thomas, and his Irish confederates, when striving for the lordship of Galloway, bound themselves to mutual fidelity by each shedding a few drops of his blood into a bowl, to which wine was added, and then lifting it to their lips in token of inviolable union. Even a century later they are described as little better than naked savages and freebooters. They spoke the Erse tongue, and belonged to the same Celtic race that had peopled Argyll, Inverness, and the north of the Forth; brave to excess, their manners were cruel and ferocious. They wore the kilt, as their under garment is described as not descending below the knee, leaving the leg downwards wholly bare; and over their shoulder they wore a rough mantle or leather coat, tanned with the hair on,

NOTE 35, p. 90.—*Recuperavit Olavus hæreditatem, etc.*

It was probably in order to announce this important event to the suzerain, King Hácon of Norway, that, as we learn from his Saga, bishop Simon of Sudrey and the abbot of Iona went to Bergen in the summer of 1226, where also Earl John of Orkney appeared, and where the king was to have an interview with Earl Skúli, his co-regent, and the archbishop of Nidaros (Hák. H. S., ch. 147). The king, it is told, settled the affairs of the Sudreyan envoys after a deliberation with Earl Skúli. It would seem that they had been sent on purpose by King Olaf. On the same occasion bishop Simon was no doubt consecrated by the archbishop, as we know for certain that the consecration took place in 1226, and it is not likely that he went to Norway twice in one year.

NOTE 36, p. 90.—*Supervenit autem Olavus rex, etc.*

Before this event, it appears that the English king tried to make peace between the brothers, as, on April 12, 1228, he directed a letter of safe conduct to Olaf and his men, for fifteen days, from Michaelmas in the same year, to repair to England, where peace was to be made between him and his brother.[a] There is, however, no trace of Olaf having accepted the offer of mediation; on the contrary, as it is told in our Chronicle, he returned to Man, expelled the bailiffs of Alan, and recaptured his kingdom.

NOTE 37, p. 92.—*Post hæc Olavus adiit, etc.*

The arrival of King Olaf in Norway did not take place in 1229, as it would appear from our Chronicle, but, according to the excellent and trustworthy Saga of King Hácon, in 1230, when the fleet, which the king intended to send to the Isles, was already equipped and ready to

which, on occasions of ceremony, was exchanged for a scarlet robe. Their hair and beards were allowed to grow to such a length as almost to cover their countenance. In battle they were armed with long spears, pointed with steel, but they were too blunt to do much execution, and often broke at the first thrust. They bore also darts or javelins, and made use of a hooked steel weapon with which they laid hold of their enemies; and on their arm they carried a shield formed of strong cow hide. No wonder that the Manx should feel indignant with Reginald for exposing their country to be harried by such cruel and ferocious savages.—Lingard, ii. 71; Burton, ii. 351; Robertson, ii. 26-28; Tytler, ii. 419.]

[a] Rymer, *Foedera*, i. 1, p. 190. [See Appendix, No. 14.]

sail. The notice, however, of the events and revolutions in the Isles had already reached Norway in the summer of 1229. That summer, it is told in the Saga, reports of great warfare came from the Sudreys (ch. 162). No doubt the unhappy son of Reginald, Godred Don, was one of the first to carry the news to Norway, as we learn from the Chronicle that in 1229 (or rather 1230) he came from Norway, whither he probably fled immediately after his father's death, the powerful Alan of Galloway being just then unable to afford him any protection, as he was absent in Ireland with his best warriors, in order to marry a daughter of the powerful Hugh de Lacy, and in returning was shipwrecked, with the loss of many of his men and danger of his own life.[a] Also Paul Bálkason (Pol filius Boke) went to Norway, no doubt sent by King Olaf, to report the events to the king and the earl, and to sue for their assistance against Alan. It would seem, however, that Paul committed the fault of befriending himself more with the earl than with the king, which was the surest way to lose the trust of the latter, as already for many years there existed between them a rivalry, which ended in open war, and with the fall of Skúli. It is evident, although not expressly told, that either from compassion for Godred, or out of distrust of Paul, and King Olaf, he recognised the claims of the former, and made a division of the kingdom between them, as we learn that Olaf and Godred arrived together in the Norwegian fleet, and immediately divided the kingdom between themselves. We learn, moreover, as well from the Saga as from the Chronicle, that also the above mentioned Uspak Agmundsson (Owmundi), now found to be really a son of Dugald, the son of Somerled, got a portion, with the title of king and the new name of Hácon; yet the part assigned to him seems not to have been taken from the possessions of Olaf and Godred; Uspak, as son of Dugald, belonged to the Somerled branch, and it is most probable that the king assigned to him those islands hitherto held by other members of the same family, who had forfeited their right to them through want of fidelity. For it is expressly said in the Saga that the kings of the Somerled branch were not to be relied upon, nor was it to be expected that when the greater part of their possessions were on the mainland, they should not generally incline more to the part of the Scotch king than to the King of Norway; their main object, however, was to maintain their own freedom through balancing adroitly between both powers. Yet through all these movements we perceive easily the chief impulse of King Alexander, who, keenly feeling the inconvenience and danger of a

[a] Fordun, ix. 47. *Chronicle of Lanercost*, ad ann. 1229.

foreign power so strong at sea as Norway was then, extending her dominions almost to the heart of his own kingdom over lands naturally belonging thereto, strove incessantly to gain possession of the Islands, and at last resorted to open war. The movements of the Constable no doubt were greatly influenced by the king's directions. We learn from the Saga (ch. 166) that Alan (of course after his return from Ireland), made great preparations for a new attack on King Olaf and the Norwegians, threatening even to cross over to Norway itself, "as it was no more difficult to go from Scotland to Norway, than vice versa, and there being no less facility of finding ports or shelter for a fleet there than in the firth of Scotland." Indeed, it was these threats, and the imminent danger, which compelled King Olaf to flee from Man to Norway, where he appeared unexpectedly, when the fleet, as mentioned above, was about to leave. As for the kings or chiefs of the Somerled line, we learn that about this period two brothers, Duncan and Dugald Skrok, sons of Dugald, the son of Somerled, were now the chief rulers in the Somerled part of the Isles, while their cousin Somerled, no doubt the son of Somerled's eldest son Gillecolum, who fell with his father in the battle at Renfrew, 1164, had enjoyed the mainland possessions of Argyle, but had been deprived of it in 1221 by King Alexander, as a punishment for having taken the part of Gillescop Mac William, the last of this long line of pretenders. This, however, does not seem to have increased his fidelity to the Norwegian crown; indeed the politics of these Somerledian descendants was to form a balance between Scotland and Norway, always keeping on the side which promised to be the most advantageous to them. Therefore it may have been a wise forethought of King Hácon to have them supplanted, or at least controlled, by a man on whose fidelity he could rely, and such a man was Uspak, the veteran royal warrior, whom he now promoted to the rank of king, moreover giving him his own name, which sounded more royally than Uspak.[a] The Saga of King Hácon (ch. 165) relates that this promotion took place at a "thing" or public meeting, which the king held in the city of Oslo in the spring of 1230, and where he proclaimed that in the impending summer he would send him to the Sudreys with a sufficient force. According to our Chronicle the expedition took

[a] The name *Úspakr*, also written *Óspakr*, is properly an adjective, *i.e.*, the word *spakr* (prudens, quietus) with the *ú* or *ó* privativum (the English *un*); *Úspakr* consequently means "unruly," "fierce." Our Chronicle and that of Lanercost spell incorrectly "Husbac." It is evident that before the detection of his real birth he must have been believed to be the son of one *Ögmundr* or Agmund (*Owmundus*). [Aumund.—Johnstone.]

place in the years 1229-30; the Saga, however, the correctness of whose chronology is beyond all doubt, places it in 1230-1231, and this is moreover confirmed by the Chronicle of Lanercost and the Icelandic annals, which assign the arrival of Uspak-Hácon to the year 1230. The events of this expedition are related at large in the Saga, while the narrative of our Chronicle is very deficient. From Oslo, we learn, Hácon repaired to Bergen, in order to prepare the armament. The king furnished eight ships, the earl three; the commander of one of these he named Paul Bálkason, a certain sign that this chieftain had sought the friendship of the earl more than that of the king. The commanders named by Hácon appear all of them to have been his "hirðmenn," or sworn followers. When the armament was ready and the fleet about to sail, King Olaf, as stated above, came to Bergen unexpectedly, driven from Man by the threats of Earl Alan.[a] His boast, however, that he would make an expedition to Norway, was only announced, as the Saga says, but not executed; and, indeed, it seems that the troubles caused by the remnants of the Mac William party, which were crushed at last in 1230,[b] but not without difficulty, had greatly occupied him, as the Constable of Scotland, and prevented his carrying out his menaces that year. Four days after the arrival of Olaf the fleet sailed, and he had nothing to do but to follow in the ship commanded by Paul Bálkason. Previously, however, it must be supposed that King Hácon had effected a kind of reconciliation between him and Godred (whose presence in Norway is not mentioned in the Saga), and had already fixed the terms of the division, which they afterwards agreed to; as it is not likely that Olaf would have done this from his own good will. The fleet touched at Orkney, where it was reinforced by nine ships, furnished, it seems, partly by Earl John, partly by the royal bailiffs; King Olaf now left Paul Bálkason's ship and took the command of one furnished by Earl John. The fleet sailed first towards Isla Sound, where the Kings Dugald and Duncan, as well as Somerled of Argyle, lay with a considerable force. Meanwhile, however, Bálki son of Paul Bálkason, and

[a] [Robertson supposes that he went to the Norwegian court in order to obtain the usual confirmation of his title to the whole kingdom of the Isles.—ii. 101.]

[b] See the Chronicle of Lanercost, ad ann. 1230. [Robertson says that the Lanercost Chronicle confounds the first with the second Gillescop, who was probably Gillescop Mahohegan, the owner of Ballenoch, and whose property passed to the Comyns as a reward for the services of the Earl of Buchan, who had both him and his two sons beheaded, A.D. 1229. The first Gillescop, the last member of the Mac William family, was executed at Forfar, with his whole family, not even his infant daughter, a child just born, escaping the axe, A.D. 1228.—ii. 20.]

another Sudreyan chieftain Ottar Snækollsson, went to Skye, where they attacked a chieftain, named in the Saga Thorkel Thormodsson (*i.e.*, Torquill Mac Dermot), who fell with two of his sons; the third, Thormod (Dermot) escaping to Scotland; this achieved, they again joined the main fleet. The cause of this diversion is not stated in the Saga; maybe it was only the carrying out a private feud between Paul and Torquill. The three Somerledian princes in Isla Sound, although they could not possibly be amicably disposed towards the Norwegians, whose aim it was to deprive them of their power and independency, did not dare to show fight, but professed friendly sentiments, and invited the Norwegian commanders to a feast, while one of them, Duncan, went on board the ship of Uspak-Hácon, no doubt as a kind of hostage. Nevertheless the Norwegians distrusted them, alleging that the Sudreyans only meant to intoxicate them with strong liquors that they might safely attack them, and easily kill them afterwards. They declined the invitation, and now both parties prepared for a battle. Uspak-Hácon, it seems, tried to avert open hostilities, but without his assent and knowledge the Norwegians made an attack, killed Somerled with many of his men, and captured Dugald. When Uspak-Hácon heard this, he suffered Duncan secretly to escape, and took Dugald, whom the Norwegians had put in irons, on board his own ship. This shows not only that Uspak-Hácon must have been invested with the chief command of the expedition, but also that he was a kind-hearted, loyal man, who meant to act as leniently as possible towards his brothers. More reinforcements now increased the fleet to eighty sail, with which the Norwegians sailed round Cantire to Bute,[a] where the castle of Rothsay had got a Scotch garrison, as mentioned above. It was besieged, and after three days taken by storm, after a spirited defence; the Norwegians lost 360 men, and, according to our Chronicle, as well as the Chronicle of Lanercost, King Uspak-Hácon was killed by a stone. From the Saga, however, which, strange to say, does not mention his being hurt, but only speaks of his subsequent sickness and death, it is evident that his death did not follow immediately. The Scotch lost

[a] Dillon, in his valuable treatise of the battle of Largs, in Archæologia Scot. ii. thinks (p. 358, 397) that Bute (Bót) is here named erroneously instead of Cantire, he having not thoroughly understood the words of the Saga, which are clear enough in the best text: "they sailed southwards, past the Mull of Cantire and into Bute." He thinks that the Saga gives a southerly direction to the whole course, not being aware that the word "southwards" only applies to the Mull, and that the following "into Bute," designs a change in the direction. Even our Chronicle and that of Lanercost mention Bute.

their commander, and the Norwegians got a large booty, together with the sum of 360 marks of silver, which a Scotch knight, taken prisoner, paid for his ransom; but soon afterwards they had the misfortune that three of the ships foundered in a storm. It being, moreover, announced that Earl Alan lay with 180 ships near the Ness of Galloway, they sailed to the south of Cantire, where they remained for a while, making frequent hostile excursions. Here King Uspak-Hácon died (from his wound), much regretted by his men; they carried his body to Iona, and buried it there. Olaf, who now got the command of the fleet, directed it southwards, eager to retake Man, the principal part of his kingdom, but the winter had already set in, and storms, it would seem, forced the fleet to seek shelter for a while under the isle of Copeland, on the Irish coast, near Donaghadee.[a] Yet the same tempest and winter appears also to have driven Earl Alan away, as there is no mention of any danger or hinderance opposed by him to the further progress of Olaf —if, indeed, the story of his great armament was after all true, not simply invented to frighten the Norwegians back. When the weather allowed it, Olaf crossed over to Man, where a chieftain, named in the Saga Thorkell Njálson, and afterwards appearing in our Chronicle as *Thorquellus filius Nel* (Torquill Mac Neil) had the command, although it is not said whether he was left by Alan as his delegate, or whether he had profited by the general disturbances to make himself lord of the island. Torquill had collected a force, and sought to prevent the Norwegians coming on shore, but when the Manx heard that King Olaf himself was their commander they declined fighting against him, and dispersed; Torquill was taken prisoner and put in irons. The Manx, however, had no reason to rejoice at their loyalty, being compelled to contribute threepence sterling for every cow on the island, and moreover to feed the Norwegian forces during the whole winter. Now, it would seem, the division between Olaf and Godred, which is only mentioned in our Chronicle and that of Lanercost, and not in the Saga, was carried into effect. Olaf, it is said, retained Man, and Godred got the "*insulanas partes*," *i.e.*, the other islands, which did not belong to the Somerledian part. That the Somerledian line retained their insular possessions is expressly stated in the Chronicle of Lanercost, it being said that Olaf, after the death of Godred, reigned both in Man and the Isles, "*exceptis his quas filii Sumerledi tenuerunt undecim annis*" (*i.e.*, all the eleven years of Olaf's

[a] The island is called the "Kaupmannsey" (merchant's island) in the Saga. It cannot be any other than Copeland Island.

reign). This seems to show that after the death of Uspak-Hácon the Norwegians gave up for the moment the plan of reducing the Somerledian possessions to obedience, it being much more important to secure this hold upon Man ; and perhaps they even made a truce or treaty with the princes, or at least with Duncan ; Dugald, of whom no further mention is made, had probably been put to death. At all events, however, some hostilities did take place before such a treaty could be concluded. In the spring, namely, the Norwegians again went to Cantire, where they were met by a force of Scots ; in the ensuing fight the Scots, it is said, " came and went very loosely ;" many were killed on both sides, and while the Norwegians opposed one division of the enemy, another attacked and killed their servants, and took all their kettles, in which they prepared their meals. The Norwegians landed on several parts of Cantire, and ravaged the circumjacent territories, without, however, occupying any place ; here, therefore, they must either have concluded the truce with the Somerledians, or resolved to abandon the plan of fighting them, deeming it impracticable. Before leaving Man two captains of vessels furnished by Earl Scúli set Thorquill Mac Neil free, to the great discontent of the others, but no douht according to a secret agreement between King Olaf, Paul Bálkason and the Earl's partizans ; we learn, at least, from our Chronicle, that Thorquill afterwards appeared as the friend of Olaf's son Harold. From Cantire the Norwegians went to the Northern Isles, no doubt to help King Godred in securing his power ; in Lewis they had to fight with the above mentioned Dermot, son of Torquill Mac Dermot, who had returned, but was now compelled to flee, leaving his wife and all his possessions as a prey to the enemy. They then repaired to Orkney. But we learn from the Saga that a few days after they left, Paul Bálkason was killed by Godred, and from our Chronicle, as well as that of Lanercost, that about the same time (consequently a few days after the death of Paul), Godred was killed in the island of Lewis. This shows that the withdrawal of the Norwegians must have been the signal of fierce hostilities between the partizans of Olaf and those of Godred, and that the recent treaty did not continue of long duration. In the summer of 1231 the Norwegians returned home, and although it seems to us that they had not effected very much, King Hácon thanked them heartily for what they had done. So far, however, they had succeeded, that the supremacy of Norway in the Isles was revived, King Olaf showing himself always as a faithful vassal, although, like his brother, he appeared at the English court, and entered the service of the English king. Here, however, we know exactly the nature of the service,

as it is described in a letter from King Henry, still existing; and we learn from this letter that it contained nothing inconsistent with the duties of Olaf to his liege Lord of Norway, being only the defence of the English and Irish coasts on both sides of the St. George's Channel, for which service Olaf, like Reginald, was to hold some possessions on the Irish coasts in fief of the English Crown, and to receive certain contributions in corn and wine. This letter is dated July 11th, 1235, and the letter of safe-conduct accorded by King Henry to King Olaf for coming to his court and transacting this business, the 13th of April.[a] Yet it appears that King Hácon did take some umbrage on hearing this, and that he summoned King Olaf to Norway in order to justify himself; as there exists a letter issued by the English king on May 24th, 1236,[b] in which the latter takes the men and possessions, etc., of King Olaf under his protection, during the absence of the said Olaf in Norway, at the request of the Norwegian king; and another, dated April 8th, 1237, where the protection is renewed, and where King Olaf is spoken of as having already begun his journey to Norway.[c] The voyage, however, cannot have been completed, as we learn from our Chronicle that King Olaf was already dead, on the 21st of May 1237, in Holm Peel; nor is it mentioned in the Saga that he was ever in Norway after his short visit in 1230. Probably, therefore, he began the journey in crossing over to England, there to look for a passage to Norway, but feeling himself unwell returned to Man, where shortly afterwards he died. The Saga gives him the express testimonial of having been scrupulously faithful to the Norwegian king. The Norwegians called him "Olaf the swarthy" (Ólafr svarti), no doubt because of his complexion.

NOTE 38, p. 94.—*Quo mortuo — usque ad obitum . . . .*

It is noted above, that these words, as well as the preceding ones, from "Manniæ," are not in the text, but in the lower margin, which show that perhaps the whole entry has been inserted subsequently. The lacuna after "*obitum*" might somehow be filled up from the Chronicle of Lanercost, *ad annum* 1230, where it is said; . . . *Post hæc Olavus et Godredus venerunt ad Manniam et diviserunt inter se regnum*

[a] Extracted by Rymer, *Fœdera*, i. 1, p. 212; also in Langebek *Scriptt. Rer. Dan.* iii. p. 230. [App. 15, 16. Henry does not say that Olave is coming to England on the business of guarding the coasts, but to confer with him, *ad loquendum nobiscum.*]

[b] Extracted by Rymer, *Fœd.* i. 1, c. p. 231. *Scriptt. Rer. Dan.* iii. p. 231. [Appendix, No. 17.]

[c] [Oliver's *Mon.* ii. p. 76.]

Manniæ et Insularum; Godredus insulas (insulanas?) partes sortitus est, Olavus Manniam. Occiso autem Godredo Don, Olavus regnavit in Mannia et super omnes Sodorenses insulas exceptis quas filii Sumerledi tenuerunt undecim annis.[a] It is evident that this entry has sprung from the same source as that of our Chronicle, only the words being a little different; the wanting part, therefore, seems to have contained something to the same purpose as what is said of Olaf having reigned over all the Sudreys, with exception of those held by the Somerled branch.

NOTE 39, p. 94.—*Anni* MCCXXXVII, *xii. kal. Jun. obiit Olavus Godredi filius.*

An entry about the death of King Olaf, on the 21st of May 1237, exists in the Chronicle of Lanercost; the name of Olaf, however, is corrupted into "Alan," no doubt by a blunder of the copyist, who read "Olauus," as "Olanus" or "Alanus." He was succeeded, it is added, by his son Harold, fourteen years of age, who reigned twelve years.

NOTE 40, p. 94.—*In ipsa igitur æstate, etc.*

Of all the events told in this narrative, as well as in the entries for the years 1238, 1239, 1240, 1242, 1243, not a word is spoken in the Saga, not even of King Harold's long stay from 1239-1242 at the court of King Hácon. Indeed, it would rather seem that the latter, distrusting Harold as the secret partizan of his father-in-law, Duke Skúli, who coveted the crown, and had at last begun hostilities, summoned him to Norway in order to keep him in strict surveillance, perhaps even in prison, and that he did not release him, or confer on him his favour till after the duke's fall in 1240. The return of Harold in 1242 is also mentioned in the Chronicle of Lanercost, but "Godredus" is wrongly written, instead of "Haraldus."[b]

[a] ["*After this Olave and Godred came to Man, and divided between themselves the kingdom of Man and of the Isles; Godred got the Isles, Olave Man. After the death of Godred Don, Olave ruled over Man and all the Sudreys (Sodor Islands), with the exception of those which the sons of Somerled held, for eleven years.*"]

[b] "Eodem anno Godredus venit cum magna classe navium ad Manniam, coepitque disponere de regno suo prout voluit." ["The same year Godred (Harold) came to Man with a numerous fleet, and made such arrangements as suited him about his kingdom."]

NOTE 41, p. 96.—*Gillescrist* (*i.e.*, Gillechrist) *filius Murkertach.*

This is no doubt the same Gilchrist spoken of in the Saga of King Hácon (ch. 102), in 1224, as having then arrived at Bergen from the Isles, accompanied by Ottar Snækollsson and many other Islanders, bringing many letters about the affairs of their land.

NOTE 42, p. 98.—*Haraldus miles factus, etc.*

This did not happen, as our Chronicle says in 1247, but in 1246, see Matthew Paris (p. 474), who records this event at Easter 1246, as well as the letter of safe-conduct, dated January 9, 1246, accorded by King Henry to Harold for coming to and returning from England, from that time till Whitsunday.[a] The year 1247, however, is rightly said to be that in which King Hácon of Norway summoned Harold to his court. The Chronicle of Lanercost, which has the same entry, almost verbally agreeing with our Chronicle, adds that Harold was summoned in order to be present at the king's coronation.[b] This, however, cannot be the case, if the summons were not addressed to Harold till immediately ("*statim*") before his departure, which, as is expressly stated in both chronicles, happened in the autumn, while the coronation had already taken place on the day of St. Olaf (July 29), the summons to be present at which ought to have been issued in the spring or early in the summer. Likewise the accurate Saga of King Hácon says that Harold did not arrive in Bergen till after the departure of King Hácon to Oslo, which happened in September or October, and that he joined him at Oslo, where he passed the winter at his court.[c] If, then, the summons was not issued to Harold in the spring, which, very likely was the case, the reason cannot have been that the king wished him to be present at the coronation, but it is rather to be supposed that he had taken some umbrage from the visit of Harold at the English court, and that he requested Harold personally to afford the due explanation and justification. We have seen that Olaf likewise, the father of Harold, was summoned to Norway immediately after a visit of this kind to the English court, and no doubt for the same reasons. Very likely, how-

[a] Extracted by Rymer, l. c. p. 264. [Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 82.]

[b] Eodem [anno] misit Háco rex Nortweyæ propter Haraldum regem Manniæ ut interesset coronationi suæ, qui statim iter arripuit per Angliam autumnali tempore, etc. [In the same year Háco, King of Norway, sent to Harold, King of Man, to be present at his coronation. Harold at once set out in the autumn, through England, etc.]

[c] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 260.

ever, the presence at the coronation was given as a kind of pretext. At all events the suspicion, if there was any, cannot have lasted long, and the explanations given by Harold must have been found sufficient, as we see that he soon came into the greatest favour with the king, and obtained his daughter in marriage. This daughter was Cecilia, born about 1220, before his marriage, and widow of the most noble Sir Gregory Andresson of Stovreim († 1246), nephew of King Philip. The betrothal took place at Oslo during the winter, and the wedding was celebrated in the following summer with great splendour in the royal palace at Bergen, a few days after the terrible fire, which (on the 4th of July, 1248) devastated the greater part of the city, and no doubt spread a gloom, which the splendour of the bridal rejoicings could scarcely disperse, and which most likely gave occasion to serious apprehensions for the future fate of the young couple.[a]

NOTE 43, p. 100.—*Eodem anno obiit b. m. Symon.*

For the whole of this entry, concerning the election of a new bishop of Man after the demise of Simon, we refer to the part of our Chronicle which treats of the bishops especially.

NOTE 44, p. 100.—*Anno* MCCXLIX. *Haraldus Olavi filius, etc.*

The year is wrong, as the departure of Harold and his queen from Norway happened in 1248, two months after their marriage, and their death consequently in the following month of October or November. The Saga of King Hácon mentions expressly the departure and death of the young couple, together with the events connected therewith, in 1248;[b] likewise the Icelandic annals, and even our Chronicle, in stating afterwards that Reginald, the successor of Harold, began his reign on the 6th of May 1249, makes it impossible that Harold could have departed "*circum festum Sancti Michaelis*" in the same year; this departure must be assigned to the preceding year. However, the Chronicle of Lanercost, which has the same entry, with some small variations,[c] names likewise the year 1249, and therefore we might

[a] The fire has been described as well in the Saga, ch. 260, as by Matthew of Paris, who was an eyewitness (p. 504).

[b] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 260.

[c] Eodem anno (1249) Haraldus rex Manniæ et Insularum cum uxore sua, filia regis Nortwegiæ, et cum multis aliis clericis et laicis venit de Nortwegia redire volens ad propria. Cumque venisset prope fines Yselandiæ exorta tempestate

perhaps infer that the news of Harold's death did not reach Man till after the commencement of 1249, which surmise gains probability by the circumstance that Reginald did not begin his reign earlier than in the month of May 1249.[a] To Norway the melancholy news arrived in the beginning of the winter, as it is expressly said in the Saga that it reached King Hácon in the city of Tunsberg, immediately before he repaired to Oslo, there to spend the main part of the winter season. The circumstances of the tragical event are thus mentioned in the Saga: "the vessel which carried the royal couple with their suite, was never heard of nor seen, except that some pieces of wreck were thrown on shore by the seas, at the southernmost point of Shetland, from which it was inferred that it had perished in *Dynröst* (Sumburgh Roost, between Shetland and Fair Isle, Dynrost still surviving in the name Dunrossnes, *i.e.*, *Dynrastarnes*, the promontory of Dynröst). It is therefore obvious that by "Jadlandia," in our Chronicle, Shetland (properly *Hjaltland*, very often *Hjatland*) is meant. In the Chronicle of Lanercost the name is corrupted into "Yselandia."

During the time of Harold's departure from Norway and subsequent death, there were also two other Sudreyan princes at the court of King Hácon, of whom, however, our Chronicle makes no mention. These were *Eugenius* or *Eogan* of Argyle, whom the Saga calls *Jon*, our Chronicle (p. 104) *Johannes*, and Matthew of Paris *Oenus* or *Genus*,[b] son of

valida, naufragium pertulit, et cum omni comitatu suo demersus est. Regnavit, ut diximus, duodecim annis. ["In the same year (1249) Harold, King of Man and the Isles, with his wife, the daughter of the King of Norway, and with many other persons, both churchmen and laymen, left Norway to return home. When he reached the coast of Yseland (Shetland) a rough tempest arose, in which he was shipwrecked and drowned, together with all those who accompanied him. He reigned, as has been said, twelve years."]

[a] Rymer, 1 c. p. 338. [See in Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 83, letters of safe-conduct to Harold to come to England to confer with the king, Henry III., and perform what was due. See also two charters of Harold to the abbot of Furness.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. pp. 77, 79.]

[b] In Latin documents, Eogan is called *Eugenius* (see *Archæol. Scot.* ii. p. 399), and so even by Fordun, x. 24. In the French edition of Matthew of Paris (p. 516) he is called *Oenus*, in the London one (from which the passage concerning him is reproduced in the Archæol. Scot. l. c.) *Genus*. [Robertson calls him Ewen. He was head of the Clan Dugal, or of the De Ergadia family, the senior representative of Somerled, who first gave a predominance to the Scottish element of the Scoto-Norwegian population. Dugal was head of the De Insulis or Clan Ronald family, of which the Clan Rory was the senior branch. After his disaster at Largs, Háco conferred on Dugal Mac Roderic, the leading magnate of the Isles, and his brother Alan, the fiefs which Ewen of Argyll held of the Norwegian crown.—ii. 193.]

on the part of the Scottish king. As to selling them, he was not in such great want of silver that he felt obliged to sell his hereditary possessions. This answer the bishops brought back, and now it appears new embassies were sent every year to the same purpose, but in vain; wherefore, says the Saga, he determined very unkingly to prepare an armament, while the negotiations were still pending, that he might take the coveted Isles by main force, at the same time secretly tampering with the chieftains. He declared in his rage that he would not rest till he had planted his banner east of Thursasker[a] and conquered all the lands which the Norwegians possessed west of the North Sea, consequently even Orkney and Shetland. The first to feel his resentment was Eogan, who had just returned from Norway, and with whom he was very angry because he had sworn allegiance to the Norwegian king, although being a Scotch subject. He had him summoned to his court, and Eogan obeyed,[b] yet not before he had got a safe-conduct guaranteed by four Scotch earls. Alexander now upbraided Eogan with treachery; Eogan replying that he might very well fulfil his duties to both kings. Alexander, however, answered with the words of the gospel, that it was impossible to serve two masters at once; Eogan maintaining that this could very well be done when the two masters were not at war with each other. Now, however, when Alexander was on the eve of beginning war with Hácon, it was necessary that Eogan should declare himself for one of the two parties; and Alexander even went so far as to demand that he should yield up to him the whole fief which he had received from King Hácon (this was, as we have seen, the Isle of Mull), promising him in compensation lands of double the same extent in Scotland, and his friendship to boot. The friends and relatives of Eogan bade him most eagerly to consent; the brave Eogan, however, feeling that, although he might have the right to declare himself for the Scotch king, he could not honourably do so without previously and formally renouncing his allegiance to King Hácon, and that it would be an act of felony to yield up to his enemy the fiefs which he held from his hand; and thinking himself perhaps now doubly bound to King Hácon as he had been entrusted by him with a kind of vicegerency, declined to comply with the request, and left the court, repairing for safety to the remote island of Lewis. Alexander prepared to follow him with an armed force, and Eogan,

[a] This must have been a rock or skerry eastward either of Orkney or Shetland, the place of which we have not been able to find.

[b] Matthew of Paris does not expressly say that Eogan went personally to Alexander; the Saga, however, puts it beyond doubt.

now seriously alarmed, declared himself ready to take his part, if he would only allow him a term for renouncing his services to King Hácon and restoring to him his fief. Of this, however, Alexander would hear nothing, and sailed, but when lying at anchor in Kerrera Sound, died from a sudden fever on the 8th of July, 1249. The Saga tells, that St. Olaf, St. Magnus, and St. Columba, appeared to him in a dream the night before his death, menacing him with evils if he persisted in his design. Also Matthew of Paris, the friend of King Hácon, represents the proceedings of Alexander as unfair, saying that in the last days of his life he diverged from the path of righteousness; while Fordun, the zealous patriot, in mentioning his enmity with the Lord of Argyle, praises him, and calls him a hater of iniquity.[a] The death of Alexander saved Eogan from this imminent peril, as the son and successor of Alexander, Alexander III., was a mere boy of seven years. Eogan, it appears, continued to remain yet for a couple of years in his allegiance to the Norwegian crown, and from our Chronicle we learn that in 1250, when Harold was summoned to Norway, he acted still in the capacity of trustee or vicegerent, with which he had been invested by King Hácon, in bringing the third son of King Olaf to Man, supported by a Norwegian force. He wounded, however, the sensibility of the Manx in making use of his royal title, and the Chronicle relates how the enterprise failed. After that time it seems that Eogan resigned the title as well as his allegiance to Norway; because, in a letter still preserved, issued by him in the year 1251, he styles himself only "Eogan, knight, son of Duncan of Argyle";[b] and in 1263 he appears as the subject and decided partizan of Alexander III. We learn, however, from the Saga, that not till then did he resign his fiefs.

NOTE 47, p. 104.—*Haraldus filius Godredus Don vocatus, etc.*

Of this no mention at all is made in our Saga, neither of the other events commemorated in this and the following year. When Harold was summoned to Norway, he had even opened negotiations with the English king, as appears from a letter of safe-conduct issued by King

[a] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 265; Matthew of Paris, p. 516; Fordun, ix. 63; *Chron. de Mailros.* Kerrera (in our text Kerwaray) is called in the Saga *Kjarbarey* (Cairbar-island); in the *Chron. de Mailros*, *Geruerei* (perhaps misread for *Ceruerei*); in the edition of Fordun it is misprinted *Kerneray*, for *Kerueray*.

[b] *Archæol. Scot.* ii. 399.

Henry, December 28, 1250, "for our beloved and faithful Haraldus, King of Man," to repair to England, there to consult with the king.[a]

NOTE 48, p. 104.—*Johannes filius Dugaldi.*

The reason why Eogan of Argyle interested himself for Magnus, was perhaps that the latter had then already married his daughter; for we learn from Fordun, where the death of Magnus is related, that he had been married to "filia Eugenii de Ergadia," who after his death married Malise, Earl of Stratherne. This may also prove the identity of Eugenius or Eogan of Argyle and the here so-called Johannes fil. Dugaldi, more properly Duncani or Dungadi.

NOTE 49, p. 106.—*Juvenis qui Yuarum militem comitabatur.*

This shows that it was the partizans of Harold who fought against Magnus and Eogan.

NOTE 50, p. 108.—*Magnus Olavi filius profectus est ad curiam, etc.*

The journey of Magnus to Norway must have taken place in May 1253, as there is a letter of safe-conduct for him and his followers, issued by King Henry on April 30, 1253, to go unmolested through England to Norway, and likewise back again.[b] The presence of Magnus in Norway is also somehow mentioned in the Saga, ch. 271; that is to say, by a mistake or forgetfulness of names, John (Eogan) King of the Sudreys, is named instead of Magnus. It is said that when Hácon, in the month of June, went from Bergen with a large fleet, to meet the Swedish Earl and Regent Byrgir, at Gullbergseið (near the present site of Gothenburg), there to concert measures about a war with Denmark, he had three kings among his followers; the one was his son Hácon, already designed as his successor, the other "John, King of the Sudreys," the third King Dugald. As for John, or Eogan, however, we have seen that he had already resigned his title of king, and consequently his allegiance to Norway, in 1251; it is therefore impossible that he could have been in Norway, and in the suite of Hácon in 1253; moreover, when Magnus came to King Hácon in the end of May or begin-

[a] Rymer, i. p. 272. [See Appendix, No. 22; the date should be 1249.]

[b] [See Oliver's *Mon.* ii. p. 85. At p. 87 there is a charter of Magnus to the prior and convent of Coningshead, dated from Furness, May 3, 1256, exempting his vessels from toll and customs.]

ning of June, 1253, it is next to impossible that he should not follow the king on the expedition, and in this case there would have been four kings, if John or Eogan likewise was in the fleet. There can be no objection taken from what our Chronicle relates, that Magnus was not formally confirmed by Hácon in the kingdom till his return in 1254, for he used certainly the title of king, to which he had hereditary right, from his being received as king by the Manx in 1252. Of that formal investment in 1254, however, which no doubt took place at Christmas time, as was usual with such solemnities, no mention is made in the Saga.

NOTE 51, p. 108.—*Magnus . . . curiam domini Regis Angliæ.*

This visit took place at Easter time (about April 16), as we learn from Matthew of Paris (p. 521), and the above mentioned letter of King Henry dated on the 21st of April, in which he orders his men not to receive Harold the son of Godred or Sir Ivar. From this letter, however, it would appear that Harold then was supposed not to be any more in custody in Norway. We see, likewise, that Magnus felt it his duty to revenge as far as possible his brother's death.

NOTE 52, p. 108.—*Venit Haco, etc.*

The special motives of King Hácon's expedition are not mentioned in our Chronicle, and Fordun's narrative of this event being very deficient, we shall give shortly the whole account, chiefly from the excellent Saga of King Hácon, especially as very wrong ideas of these affairs appear to be prevailing among the Scotch public, although Dillon, in his valuable treatise of the battle of Largs (in the Archæol. Scot. vol. ii.) has done very much to correct many errors. We might, indeed, acquiesce in what Dillon has done, if it were not that he too had been mistaken in some points. About the events in the islands between 1249 and 1261 the Saga is utterly silent, nor do we learn much from our Chronicle and the Scotch historians. Where the Saga resumes the narrative of the events in the Isles, the above mentioned Dugald (Dugald Mac Rory) is now generally spoken of as the sole king in his part of the Isles. He is characterised as being firm and unshaken in his fidelity to King Hácon; we find, moreover, that one of his sons, named Eric, remained at King Hácon's court, no doubt as a kind of hostage; and this Eric continued to reside in Norway, even after the cession of the Isles to Scotland, as one of the principal barons of Nor-

way. Eogan, although the connection between him and Norway does not seem to have been formally severed, or at least the hope of King Hácon not quite given up, that he might still be brought back to his allegiance, is nevertheless mentioned as a secondary person. We have seen that he had dropped the title of king in 1251, perhaps he had then already sworn allegiance to the young King Alexander, although he did not resign his Norwegian fiefs till the arrival of King Hácon himself in 1263. When King Alexander became of age (1262) and even a short time before, he resumed the plan cherished by his father, of reuniting the Sudreys to the Scottish crown, and sent two envoys to Norway in 1261 ; an archdeacon and a knight named Missell,[a] no doubt to negotiate for the cession of the Isles. The king, however, it is said, got to know that they used only fair words without sincerity ; being, perhaps, aware of his displeasure, they tried to steal secretly away, without asking for passports, contrary to all custom ; but they were stopped by express order of the king, who told them, that as a punishment they should stay in Norway the whole winter. King Alexander, on receiving news of this, was much exasperated ; he complained to his father-in-law, King Henry of England, who wrote to King Hácon about the 23d of March 1262,[b] about the release of the envoys and other matters ; it is even hinted that the envoys were not treated decently, which, however, appears not to be true, as we find that Sir Missell was present at the coronation of King Magnus[c] on the 14th of September 1261, and seemingly in one of the best places in the church.[d] The accusation was also formally denied in a letter from Hácon, in which he bade King Henry to understand that now he had permitted the envoys to return withour any hindrance, solemnly protesting that it had not been his intention to begin war with the King of Scots ; the receipt of which letter King Henry acknowledged in another, dated November 15, 1262, expressing his gratitude for the kindness shown by Hácon to the envoys, offering his mediation, and promising to exert his influence with the King of Scots in order to induce the latter to repair the damages which King Hácon or his subjects had suffered from himself or his men.[e] Meanwhile, however, matters had changed ; in

[a] [Robertson conjectures that Missell is an error for Frisel, an ancient form of the name of Fraser ; ii. 83.]

[b] Rymer, i. p. 389. [See Appendix, No. 24.]

[c] [He was highly edified at some of the ceremonies on that occasion, exclaiming, "They told me there were no knights created in this northern land, but never saw I knight dubbed with greater solemnity."—Robertson, ii. 83.]

[d] Hák. H. Saga, ch. 309. [e] Rymer, i. p. 422. [See Appendix, No. 25.]

the summer of 1262 there came a letter from King Dugald announcing that Earl William of Ross, with other Scotch chieftains, had made an attack upon the Isle of Skye, and committed the most barbarous cruelties, burning churches and houses, killing men and women, and staking small children upon spears; it was added that King Alexander meant to conquer all the Isles. It is therefore evident that the attack was made by his order; we find, moreover, that hostages were taken from Skye, and kept in custody at the cost of the Crown.[a] Hácon being now greatly alarmed, determined, after duly deliberating with his council, to go to war with Scotland, which indeed was unavoidable, the Scotch having already commenced hostilities. This, we expressly beg to remark, as Scotch historians, not aware of the real state of things, have taxed Hácon with duplicity for using so fair words when really making preparations for war.[b] Fordun (x. ch. 16, 17), speaks with some uncertainty about a rumour that some of the Scotch magnates had written secretly to Hácon, promising to aid him against their king, if he came to Scotland; how far this be true, must remain in doubt, because we want more accurate accounts thereof; yet the party-spirit in Scotland in those times is so well known, that there would be no wonder if letters of the above description were really written. In the beginning of 1263 King Hácon issued orders for collecting the forces, which were to assemble at Bergen towards the commencement of the summer. Here the king, who had passed the winter at Throndheim, arrived on the 3d of May, and was shortly afterwards joined by his son King Magnus. The king, it is said, despatched two men, both, as it appears, natives of Scotland or the western countries, John (probably grandson, by a daughter, to Earl Harold in Orkney) and Henry Scott, to the Sudreys for the purpose of collecting good pilots for the fleet on its sailing through the intricate sounds and lochs of western Scotland; perhaps they also had to summon Earl Magnus of Orkney to Norway, as we learn from the Saga that he indeed was present there during the summer, and sailed from Bergen with the fleet. Maybe King Hácon thought it rather unsafe to trust him in his double capacity of vassal to the crown of Norway as well as to that of Scotland, without exacting from him some extraordinary oaths and securities, especially as we find that King Alexander had forced the men of Caithness to give host-

[a] Fragm. of Chamberlains Rolls, in *Archæol. Scot.* ii. 363.

[b] Lord Hailes, *Annals*, i. 212. Even if Hácon had acted with duplicity, which was not the case, he might justify himself sufficiently with the fact that King Alexander had begun hostilities, and tampered with the king's vassals while still negotiating.

ages, as he had those of Skye.[a] Or perhaps Alexander had infested Magnus with war, and that Magnus fled to Hácon for protection. The two above mentioned messengers repaired to King Dugald and told him that the fleet would arrive. The Scotch, it is said, meant to attack the Isles even this summer, but Dugald now gave out the rumour that a Norwegian fleet of forty sail might be expected; this news made the Scotch hesitate in beginning the attack.

When the forces were collected the king summoned them to a meeting, at which he narrated the outrages committed by the Scotch, and declared his intention to take revenge. The government at home he committed to his son Magnus, with two prudent and expert barons as councillors. Before leaving Bergen himself, he sent some barons with eight ships, as it appears, to the assistance of King Magnus of Man; they were, however, detained by contrary winds, so that in reality they did not leave the coasts of Norway till after the main fleet, yet they made it up by sailing so much faster, and some of them did not see land till passing Souliskerry; thence they made for Diurnes, where they landed, destroying a castle and burning twenty farms; at last they joined King Magnus of Man. The king, meanwhile, had moved from Bergen to the neighbouring port of Eidsvaag, and from thence to the out-port of Herdluver, whence he sailed directly for Shetland, on the 15th of July.

Among the great men who followed him in the fleet was Earl Magnus of Orkney, as aforesaid, whom he presented with a good ship of war, a sign of the excellent understanding now existing between them, the two bishops, Thorgils of Stavanger and Gilbert of Hamer, formerly archdeacon of Shetland, the Abbot of Holm, etc. The number of ships forming the fleet is not precisely given in the Saga, which says only that, when complete, it exceeded 120 sail; Fordun states the number of ships with which King Hácon appeared off Ayr to have been about 160, with a force of 20,000 men; and this seems to be, on the whole, not far from the truth. That the reports of the armament, preceding the king's arrival in the western seas, caused no little alarm in Scotland and even in England, appears from a letter written by R. de Neville, to the royal chancellor of England, in order to get sufficient money for guarding the lands and castles assigned to his care north of Trent, especially Bamborough, as it was said, and believed to be true, that not only the Norwegian but also the Danish king, had arrived at the Isles with a large fleet, it not being ascertained whither they meant to repair.[b]

[a] Fragm. of Chamberl. Rolls, l. c. [b] Rymer, i. p. 429. [See Appendix, 26.]

Of the preparations made by the King of Scots, the fragments of "Chamberlains Rolls," quoted by Dillon (*Archæologia Scot.* ii. 389-391) give ample evidences; we see that the fortifications of Inverness, Ayr, Wigtoun, Stirling, and perhaps other castles, were repaired, and the garrisons increased, vessels built, etc. Especially the castle of Ayr, where the chief attack must have been expected, appears to have been the centre of the movements. Two chieftains, no doubt of the Somerled branch, Angus Mac Donald of Isla, and Murchard, were compelled to yield their sons as hostages.[a] In two days the greater part of the fleet reached Shetland, where the king remained in Bressa Sound for about a fortnight, probably waiting for those vessels which during the passage had been separated from the main fleet. About the 20th of July the king sailed to the Orkneys, and anchored in Elwick harbour, at Shapensey, opposite Kirkwall. Here he held a council of war, declaring his plan of dividing the fleet in two parts, of which the smaller, chiefly consisting of yeomen or the militia troops, was directed to run into Moray firth and ravage the east coast of Scotland, while with the greater, under his own command, he intended to go at once to the Sudreys. This resolution, however, being announced to the men, the yeomen[b] declared that they would go nowhere except under the immediate command of the king, whose authority was not so great but that he felt obliged to yield. No division, therefore, took place.

Immediately after St. Olaf's day (July 29), which was celebrated with great solemnity, the king moved from Elwick to Ronaldsvoe, where again he lay for about eleven days, despatching men to Caithness, there to exact a contribution from the inhabitants, threatening them with immediate attack and ravages if they did not comply. They obeyed; although, as we have seen, having beforehand given hostages to King Alexander in pledge of their fidelity. During the king's stay at Ronaldsvoe, the Saga relates that an eclipse of the sun happened, only a small ring around the sun being bright. This is a strong proof of the accuracy and trustworthiness of the Saga, as it may be seen from the eclipse tables that an eclipse really happened on the 5th of August, and, according to special calculation, this eclipse appeared an-

[a] Fragment of Chamberl. Rolls, l. c. [Angus, the son of Donald M'Reginald, was a cousin of Dugald, and the head of the youngest branch of the family of Argyll and the Isles. Seven years before this expedition he had been forced by the regents, during Alexander's minority, to acknowledge that he held his fiefs of the Scottish crown, though he had in vain sought an asylum in Ireland to prevent the necessity of such an admission.—Robertson, ii. 87.]

[b] [Robertson calls them bonders.]

nular precisely at Ronaldsvoe.[a] On St. Lawrence day (August 10) the king sailed from Ronaldsvoe, having ascertained that some ships not yet ready when he left Bergen, had arrived at the Sudreys. The Orkneyans, who were also to furnish ships and troops, had not yet completed their armament, but the earl was ordered to follow as soon as he had got ready. However, on the same day, the king doubled Cape Wrath, the next he went to Lewis, thence eastward of Skye to Rona and Raasay, and into the Sound of Skye, where he anchored near a little island called Kerlingarsteinn or Cailleach-stone.[b] Here he was joined by the King of Man, and the barons who had been sent away beforehand. He then proceeded to the Sound of Mull, falling in with King Dugald, who came in a light craft, now acting as a pilot-boat, and requested the king to follow as fast as possible. In this manner the fleet was conducted to Kerrera, where the forces gathered in the Isles were already assembled, and joining the main fleet, brought the total number of ships to the amount already mentioned.

From Kerrara King Hácon sent fifty ships under the command of King Dugald, King Magnus, and some Norwegian barons, to the Isthmus of Kentire, and fifteen ships to Bute, where the castle of Rothsay was held by a Scotch garrison; while he went himself, with the rest of the fleet, round Kentire to Gigha. His object was evidently first of all to intimidate the above mentioned chieftains, Angus of Isla and Murchard, and this aim seems to have been easily effected. They offered their submission through the medium of King Dugald; and notwithstanding their having previously given hostages to King Alexander sought audience of King Hácon, throwing themselves upon his mercy, swearing allegiance, and pledging their faith by giving hostages; in return King Hácon promised to have them included in the treaty of peace, if such should be effected. Their possessions in Kentire were taxed to a contribution of 1200 cattle. Meanwhile, the frequently mentioned Eogan, who, it seems, although declaring for Alexander, had not yet formally resigned his Norwegian fiefs, appeared, perhaps summoned to do so, in the king's presence. He went on board the ship of bishop Thorgils,

[a] See *Archæol. Scot.* ii. p. 363-64.

[b] *Kerlingr*, in Lowlands *Carline* (vetula) is the same as *Cailleach* in Gaelic, so the place has not changed its name. It seems to be a common belief in the west of Scotland that Kyle Háken, between Skye and Lochalsh, has got its name from King Hácon having anchored there. Nothing can be more absurd. This name, as no doubt most of the other local names, was certainly many centuries older than King Hácon. It is, moreover, very probable, that the greater part of the rude inhabitants did not even know his name.

no doubt to claim his protection, and bade the king release him from his allegiance, as well as to receive back the above mentioned fiefs, because he had now sworn oaths of fidelity to King Alexander. The king at first desired him to consider the matter, and retained him in the fleet for a while, without, however, shaking his purpose.[a] The abbot of Sandal[b] applied personally to the king for a safe-conduct to his monastery, which was immediately granted. Shortly afterwards, when the Dominican friar, brother Simon, who had been employed by the king in several diplomatic missions, and had now even followed him on this expedition, happened to die while the fleet lay off Gigha, his body was interred in the church of Sandal, and the monks there believed him to be a saint. The Scotch knight who had the command of Donaverty castle,[c] in Kentire, no doubt terrified at the progress of the king, and at the hostilities already commenced in his neighbourhood, capitulated; the king thereon appointed a Norwegian, Guthorm Bakkakolf, commander of the castle. Kentire being thus reduced, the king sent some light vessels to hasten the reduction of Rothsay castle, but that was now superfluous, the castle having already capitulated on the condition that the garrison should depart unmolested. This condition, however, was violated by one Rory, of whom our Saga relates that he had been outlawed by King Alexander, because he asserted the Island of Bute to be his patrimony, and failing to get this claim acknowledged by the Scotch king, had committed many hostilities in Scotland; but that when King Hácon appeared in these parts, he had come to him with his two brothers for protection, and sworn him allegiance; at the siege of Rothsay he had commanded a ship, and now, the garrison having departed according to the capitulation, he overtook it and killed nine men, alleging that he personally had not promised them anything.[d] There can hardly be any doubt that this Rory, whose father and ancestors are not mentioned in the Saga, was a descendant of Somerled.[e] From Bute, the Norwegians and Rory of their own accord, made inroads upon the mainland of Scotland, committing many

[a] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 320.

[b] *Ibid.* The Saga does not mention the name of the monastery, but speaks only of an "abbot of a grey-monk's cloister;" thus, however, the Cistercians were styled, and the monastery of Sandal in Kentire is the only Cistercian monastery of which there could be question. [Robertson writes it Saddel, ii. 87.]

[c] Even this castle is not expressly named, but only styled "a castle in the south of Kentire." [d] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 321.

[e] [Rory or Roderic was probably a descendant of one of the earlier lords of Bute.—Robertson, ii. 88.]

ravages. The mouth of the Clyde now lay open to the Norwegian fleet. The wind, that for a time had prevented the king from leaving Gigha, now became favourable; he sailed with the whole fleet round the Mull of Kentire to Arran, and anchored in Lamlash harbour, on the east side of Arran, opposite the main coast of Scotland.[a] He passed, consequently, the town of Ayr, situated on this coast, where, it appears, as we have seen, the main attack had already been expected by the Scottish king.[b] To this sailing past, or no doubt quite close to, Ayr, Fordun alludes, narrating that "*Rex Aco Norvegiæ venit apud Novum Castrum de Are cum piraticis navibus octies viginti, habentibus intra se viginti millia hominum belligerorum.*"[c] Fordun, we remark, does not say that he *landed*, only that he *arrived* off Ayr; yet his words have been misinterpreted by Buchanan, who says expressly that Hácon landed at Ayr with 20,000 men. It is, however, an error, when Fordun gives the 1st of August (*Petri ad vincula*, Lammass) as the date of this arrival, which must rather have occurred a month later, as the king had not yet left the Orkneys on the day of the eclipse, which happened on the 5th of August.

When King Hácon appeared off Ayr, and anchored at Arran, King Alexander, who appears to have been present himself at Ayr or in the neighbourhood of the town with the greater part of his forces, now opened negotiations, sending several messages by Franciscan or Dominican friars, for the purpose of treating for peace. Nor did King Hácon show himself unwilling to negotiate, and proved this sufficiently by permitting Eogan of Argyle to depart in peace, loading him moreover with presents, on the condition that he should do his best to bring about a reconciliation; Eogan pledging himself, if he did not succeed, to return to King Hácon.[d] Perhaps it was due to the exertions of

[a] Lamlash is called Melasey in the Saga, Molassa by Buchanan; it has got its name from the hermit St. Macliosa (servant of Jesus) or Malise, otherwise Molios, to whose cave pilgrimages were made and votive gifts offered.

[b] We learn even that King Alexander had taken quarters in Ayr, when negotiations were opened, shortly after the arrival of King Hácon to Arran.

[c] Fordun, ii. 15. [*King Háco of Norway came to New Town Ayr with a pirate fleet of* 160 *ships, having on board* 20,000 *fighting men.*]

[d] [Robertson says that Ewen had refused to swerve from his allegiance to Alexander, but he offered, as he had done on a similar occasion, fourteen years before, to resign the fiefs which he held of the Norwegian crown. When Háco found that he could not shake his resolution he dismissed him honourably, and with many marks of favour. Twice, in situations of difficulty, had the Lord of Argyll proved his good faith and honour, in an age in which the obligations of an oath were but too often lightly esteemed; ii. 86.]

Eogan that a truce was concluded, in order to commence negotiations in a more formal manner. King Hácon now despatched an embassy, consisting of the two bishops, Gilbert of Hamar and Henry of Orkney, with three barons, to Alexander, whom they found at Ayr ;[a] they were well received, but could not get any definite answer, Alexander alleging that before proposing the conditions he must consult with his councillors ; this done, he should not fail to let King Hácon know the result. The Norwegian messengers therefore returned to their king, who meanwhile had removed to Bute ;[b] the next day, however, messengers arrived from King Alexander, bringing a list of those islands which he would not resign, viz. Arran, Bute and the Cumreys (that is, generally speaking, the islands inside Kentire), which implies that he now offered to renounce his claim to all the others. It is certainly not to be wondered at that he did not like to see those islands, which commanded the entrance to the Clyde, in the hands of another power. King Hácon, however, had prepared another list, containing the names of all those islands which he claimed for the crown of Norway ; and although the exact contents are not known, there can be no doubt that at least Arran and Bute were among the number. The Saga says that, on the whole, there was after all no great difference ; but that, nevertheless, no final reconciliation could be obtained, the Scotchmen trying only to protract the negotiations because the summer was past and the bad weather had begun. The Scotch messengers at last returned, and King Hácon removed with the fleet to the Cumreys, near Largs, in the district of Cuningham, no doubt with a view either of being nearer at hand, if the negotiations failed, and a landing was to be effected, or only of intimidating his opponents and hastening the conclusion of the peace, as the roadstead in itself seems to have been far less safe than that of Lamlash or Bute. King Alexander sent indeed several messages, and it was agreed to hold a new congress a little farther up in the country, which shows that King Alexander now had removed from Ayr to a spot nearer Largs, perhaps

[a] In the Saga, which alone records these facts, the town where the messengers found King Alexander is called *Noar*, which evidently is a corruption of *New Ayr* (New-town of Ayr).

[b] There can be no doubt that during the stay in Lamlash harbour, either this time or when the fleet returned thither in October, many devout Norwegians made visits to St. Maclios' Cave, and it is very likely that it is one of these visitors who has left a short runic inscription, still to be seen, and first discovered and published by Dr. Wilson in his *Archæology of Scotland* ;—viz. Nikulos a Hæne ræist, *i.e.*, Nicholas on Hæn engraved (scil. the runes) ; Hæn seems to be the Norwegian estate of this name in the Raumsdal, and the runes have exactly the character peculiar to those used in Norway in the thirteenth century.

to Camphill (on the road from Largs to Kilbirnie), where a local tradition states the king encamped.[a] The Norwegian messengers were, as before, some bishops and barons; the Scotch commissaries were some knights and monks; the deliberations were long, but still without any result; at last, when the day was declining, a crowd of Scotchmen began to gather, and as it continued to increase, the Norwegians, not thinking themselves safe, returned without having obtained anything. The Norwegian warriors now demanded earnestly that the truce should be renounced, because their provisions had begun to be scarce, and they wanted to plunder. King Hácon accordingly sent one of his esquires, named Kolbein, to King Alexander, with the letter issued by this monarch, ordering him to claim back that given by himself, and thus declare the truce to be ended; previously, however, proposing that both kings should meet at the head of their respective armies and try a personal conference before coming to extremities; only if that failed, they might go to battle as the last expedient. King Alexander, however, did not declare his intention plainly, and Kolbein, tired of waiting, delivered up the letter, got that of King Hácon back, and thus rescinded the truce. He was escorted to the ships by two monks. Kolbein, when reporting to King Hácon his proceedings, told him that Eogan of Argyle had earnestly tried to dissuade King Alexander from fighting with the Norwegians; it does not seem, however, that Eogan went back to Hácon, according to his promise. This monarch now was greatly exasperated, and desired the Scottish monks, when returning, to tell their king that he would very soon recommence the hostilities and try the issue of a battle.

Accordingly, King Hácon detached King Dugald, Alan Mac Rory his brother, Angus of Isla, Murchard of Kentire, and two Norwegian commanders,[b] with sixty ships, to sail into Loch Long, and ravage the circumjacent parts, while he prepared to land himself with the main force at Largs, and fight the Scotch army. The detachment does not appear to have met with any serious resistance, all the Scotch forces being probably collected near Largs. The banks of Loch Lomond and the whole of Lennox were ravaged; Angus even ventured across the country to the other side, probably near Stirling, killing men and taking a great number of cattle. This done, the troops who had been on shore returned to the ships. Here, however, a terrible storm, which

[a] See Dillon, *Archæol. Scot.* l. c.

[b] [Robertson, citing the Saga of Háco, adds to their number Magnus of Man; ii. 90, n.]

blew for two days (October 1 and 2), wrecked ten vessels, and one of the Norwegian captains was taken sick and died suddenly.[a]

Also the main fleet, off Largs, suffered greatly by the same tempest. It began in the night between Sunday (September 30) and Monday (October 1), accompanied by violent showers; a large transport vessel drifted down on the bow of the royal ship, swept off the gallion, and got foul of the cable; it was at last cast loose, and drifted towards the island; but on the royal ship it had been necessary to remove the usual awnings or covers; and in the morning (October 1) when the flood commenced the wind likewise turned, and the vessel, along with another vessel of transport and a ship of war, was driven on the main beach, where it stuck fast, the royal ship drifting down while with five anchors, and only stopped when the eighth had been let go. The king had found it safest to land in a boat on the Cumrey with the clergy, who celebrated mass, the greater part believing that the tempest had been raised by witchcraft. Soon the other ships began to drift; several had to cut away the masts; five drifted towards the shore, and three went aground. The men on board these ships were now dangerously situated, because the Scotch, who from their elevated position could see very well what passed in the fleet, sent down detachments against them, while the storm prevented their comrades in the fleet from coming to their aid. They manned, however, the large vessel, which had first drifted on shore, and defended themselves as well as they could against the superior force of the enemy, who began shooting at them. Happily the storm abated a little, and the king was not only able to return on board his ships, but even send them some aid in boats; the Scotch were put to flight, and the Norwegians were able to pass the night on shore. Yet in the dark some Scots found their way to the vessel and took what they could. In the morning (Tuesday, October 2), the king himself, with some barons and some troops went on shore in boats, to secure the valuable cargo of the transport, or what was left of it, in which they succeeded; now, however, the main army of the Scots was seen approaching, and the king, who at first meant to remain on shore and head his troops himself, was prevailed upon by his men, who feared lest he should expose himself too much, to return on board his ship. The number of the Norwegians left on shore did not exceed 1000 men, 240 of whom, commanded by the baron Agmund Krokidans, occupied a hillock, the rest were stationed on the beach. The Scotch, it is related in the Saga, had about 600 horsemen in armour, several of whom had Spanish steeds,

[a] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 323.

all covered with mail; they had a great deal of infantry, well-armed, especially with bows and Lochaber axes.[a] The Norwegians believed that King Alexander himself was in the army; perhaps this was true;[b] we learn, however, from Fordun, that the real commander was Alexander of Dundonald, the Stewart of Scotland.

The Scotch first attacked the knoll on which were the 240 men, who retired slowly, always facing the enemy and fighting; but in retracing their steps downhill, as they could not avoid accelerating their movement as the impulse increased, those on the beach believed that they were routed, and a sudden panic betook them for a moment, which cost many lives, for as the boats were too much crowded they sank with their load; others, who did not reach the boats, fled in a southerly direction, and were pursued by the Scotch, who killed many of them; others sought refuge in the aforesaid stranded vessel; at last they rallied behind one of the stranded ships of war, and an obstinate battle began, the Norwegians, now that the panic was over, fighting desperately. Then it was, that the young and valiant Piers of Curry,[c] of whom also Fordun and Wyntown speak, was killed by the Norwegian baron Andrew Nicholasson,[d] after having twice ridden through the Norwegian ranks. The storm for a while prevented King Hácon from aiding his men, and the Scotch, being tenfold stronger, began to get the upper hand; but at last two barons[e] succeeded in landing with fresh troops, when the Scotch were gradually driven back upon the knoll, and then put to flight towards the hills. This done, the Norwegians returned on board the ships. On the following morning (October 3) they returned on shore to carry away the bodies of the slain, which, it appears, they effected quite unmolested by the enemy; all the bodies

[a] This weapon is called *sparða* in the Saga, *i.e.*, the Irish *sparthe*, which, indeed, seems to have been nothing more than a Lochaber axe, or at least very like it; from the Orkney Saga and Olafs S. helga, ch. 94, we learn, that it was a kind of axe on a long shaft with a hook. A weapon of this kind in the hands of the Scotch from Ayrshire and the Highlands must have been a Lochaber axe.

[b] [Burton (ii. 107) says that none of the crown vassals were mustered, and that none of the great feudatories of the crown were there, nor any commander of note, but that it was simply a miscellaneous gathering of the peasantry that hastily assembled to resist the incursion. Robertson (ii. 91,) says that the infantry, who were destined to bear the brunt of the conflict, were merely the peasantry of the neighbouring districts, hastily brought together by the blaze of the beacon fires, and mostly armed with spears or bows, the whole force being under the command of the Steward of Scotland, though the Norse chronicler has erroneously supposed that Alexander was present in person.] [c] [Sir Piers Currie.]

[d] [Aiming at the thigh, he clave, with a single blow, through bone and armour, and buried his sword in the saddle.] [e] [Reginald and Olave.]

were carried to a church, no doubt in Bute,[a] and there buried. The next day (Thursday, October 4), the king removed his ship farther out under the island, and the same day the detachment arrived which had been sent to Loch Long. The following day (Friday, October 5), the weather being fair, the king again sent men on shore to burn the stranded ships, which likewise appears to have been effected without any hinderance from the enemy. On the same day he removed with the whole fleet to Lamlash harbour.[b]

We have not deemed it superfluous to give here at some length these particulars of the celebrated battle of Largs, extracted from the plain narrative of the Saga, with a view of removing at least some of the erroneous and almost ridiculous ideas which have prevailed, and still no doubt prevail, about it in Scotland and England. We do not intend, however, to waste many words upon the insane belief of so many amateur antiquarians, that the expedition of King Hácon was neither more nor less than a piratical excursion in the old pagan Viking-style; that "*the warlike*"[c] King Hácon was "the last of the Vikings"; and that his men, who fell in the battle, were buried as pagans, inasmuch as the cairns, cromlechs, and other sepulchral monuments from the pagan times discovered at Largs have been invariably believed to belong to those christian Norwegian warriors, who fought on 1st and 2d of October 1263;[d] an error, the glaring enormity of which indeed even the most superficial knowledge of general history (not to speak of ecclesiastical history) might seem sufficient to expose, not to speak of the facts, specially recorded, that the king brought bishops and clergymen

[a] It is afterwards related that the body of Ivar Holm, the captain who died suddenly on the expedition of the Loch Long squadron, was carried to Bute and buried there, when this squadron returned; hence we may guess that the other bodies were also buried on the same spot. [b] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 323-326.

[c] Thus he is styled by Lord Hailes, and we believe even by Sir Walter Scott in his History of Scotland. Hácon, however, although in his younger days he was compelled to some fighting, was by no means a warlike monarch, his merits (and he is indisputably the best king Norway ever had) consisted chiefly in pursuits of peace,—as legislative improvements, founding of cities, promoting of useful knowledge, of trade, etc.

[d] We quote here the words of Dr. Wilson in his *Archæology*, p. 325, "A reference to the old and new Statistical Accounts of the various parishes, along both the Ayrshire and Argyleshire coasts, will suffice to shew that the battle of King Húco has proved as infallible a source of explanation for the discovery of cists, tumuli, cairns, and sepulchral relics of every kind, as if it were a well authenticated fact that no one had died, from the days of Noah to our own, but at the battle of Largs." Sir Walter Scott is seen to have participated in the same error, when writing his *Marmion* (Canto iii, note 4), where the pagan relics found at Largs are attributed to the slain subjects of King Húcon.

with him, and that all the bodies of the slain Norsemen were removed from the spot.[a] Yet apart from this almost unaccountable hallucination, there are still serious errors left. Firstly, the exaggerated description, given by Fordun,[b] of the ravages which the Norwegian fleet suffered from the storm had given rise to the belief that King Hácon lost thousands of his men, and that, indeed, his power was entirely broken. Now everybody accustomed to use historical records will perceive at the first glance, that the narrative of the whole affair, as given in the Saga, does not admit of any serious doubt; the events being told minutely and candidly, without extenuating or exaggerating; and that it has been evidently written after the relation of eye-witnesses or participators, which indeed, was very easy, as the author, Sturla Thordson from Iceland, finished the Saga two years afterwards.[c] There was no reason why it should not be stated, if more ships were lost than the six or seven here mentioned, or if more men were killed, than what we may calculate from the fact that at the highest estimation not more than 1500 could have taken part in the fight from first to last, the greater part of whom seem even to have survived. Indeed, if the loss had been so great as Fordun intimates, the Saga would have bewailed it, according to its wont, in quite other strains; and the movements of the king had been quite different.[d]

[a] That the bodies were removed is also expressly stated in the Melrose Chronicle, which, indeed, although making too much of the reverses suffered by the Norwegians in the battle, or rather omitting the fact that the Scotch were finally driven back, does in the whole not diverge more from the narrative of the Saga than the difference of information and national feeling may account for; we give it here: *Anno domini* 1263 (the old edition has erroneously 1262) *Háco Rex Norwagiæ cum copiosa navium multitudine venit per mare occidentale ad debellandum regem Scotiæ, sed re vera, ut ipse H. affirmabat, non eum repulit vis humana sed virtus divina, quæ naves eius confregit et in exercitum suum mortalitatem immisit; insuper et eos qui tertia die post sollemnitatem Sti. Michaelis ad proeliandum convenerant, per pedissequos patriæ debellavit atque prostravit, quapropter coacti sunt cum vulneratis et mortuis suis naves suas repetere, et sic turpius quam venerant repatriare.* [*In* 1263, *Háco, King of Norway, came from the west with a numerous fleet to wage war with the King of Scotland; but in truth, as Háco himself was wont to say, he was defeated not by human arms, but by the divine power, which disabled his vessels and crushed his army, routing and overthrowing, by means of the followers of their country, those who had mustered on the third day after the feast of St. Michael for the purpose of battle, and forcing them to make for their ships with their wounded and dead, and so to return home more disgracefully than they had come.*]

[b] Fordun, x. 10. [c] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 275.

[d] [Robertson calls it a skirmish, not a battle; and he says that as the action was indecisive so were its results unimportant, for it would be erroneous to

It is stated in the Saga[a] that when King Hácon was at anchor near Gigha, previous to his sailing round Kentire to Arran, there came a deputation to him from the Irish, offering him their allegiance if he would help them to throw off the English yoke; and that he so far showed himself favourable to their wish that he sent a Sudreyan, named Sigurd, back with them to ascertain what inducements they might offer him. Now, during his stay in Lamlash harbour, after the battle, Sigurd returned from Ireland with the offer on the part of the Irish, that they would entertain his host the whole winter if he would come and help them. And, it is said, he was greatly inclined to do so, but the army was averse to it, and as the wind happened to fail, while provisions began to be scarce, he gave up the plan. He could not, however, have entertained the idea for a single moment if he had really felt himself so weak, as must needs have been the case if the relation of Fordun were true. Moreover, we learn that the Scotch army did not prevent his men from removing their dead to the ships,[b] nor even,

ascribe the failure of the expedition to the repulse of a few hundred shipwrecked Norwegians by the half-armed peasantry of the neighbourhood. Seven Norwegians of distinction were slain, while only one man of note fell upon the side of the Scots; ii. 94.]

[a] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 322.

[b] Dillon, in his treatise, taking it for granted that the Norwegians were discomfited, and that the Scots were masters of the field, cannot, of course, reasonably explain how the Norwegians were able to remove their dead, without supposing that a truce or convention for burying the slain had been concluded. Afterwards, he wonders, without being able to give any explanation, how they were allowed to destroy the ships. These facts, however, explain themselves sufficiently from the narrative in the Saga, without in the least calling for any necessity of supposing a convention to have been made. The fact was, simply, that the Scots had retired, and entirely left the field to the Norwegians. By a miscalculation, Dillon believes the day when the stranded ships were destroyed to be the 12th, instead of the 5th, of October: this indeed, must make the impunity with which the destruction was effected, seem still more unaccountable. The miscalculation arises from the Icelandic denomination of Thursday "*fimti-dagr*" (fifth day, *feria quinta*), which has caused many similar mistakes. The 3d of October was a Wednesday: on Thursday (October 4), says the Saga, the king removed his ship farther out under the island; "*fimtadaginn*," is here erroneously construed to be the fifth day after the 3d of October, *i.e.*, the 8th of October; and when the Saga continues, "on Friday, the weather being fair, the king sent men to burn the stranded ships," this Friday is consequently believed to be the Friday after the 8th of October, *i.e.*, 12th. Afterwards, the Saga itself says that on Sunday, the 14th of October (the first in the winter), the king left Isla Sound, after a stay there of two nights; having previously stopped one night (the 11th) at Gigha, one (the 10th) at Sandey, one (the 9th) under Arran, and "some nights" near Lamlash. Although, as we have demonstrated, the Scotch cannot have been near when the Norwegians removed the slain, and there was therefore nothing to

two days afterwards, burning the stranded vessels ; an ample proof that they had retired from the place ; a fact which, partly at least, must have been due to the valiant defence and real victory of the Norwegians ; partly, perhaps, to the circumstance that the news of the ravages committed by the other Norse detachment in Lennox, etc., which could not have reached the king or the steward till then, no doubt induced them to send troops to those parts, or perhaps even to hasten thither with the whole army. Lastly, we learn that King Alexander did not retake a single island ; but that King Hácon, on his return, disposed of Arran, Bute, and even Donaverty, without any hinderance. The tempests, of course, prevented the Norwegians from effecting any thing more than defending themselves, and repelling the hostile attack, no doubt with a comparatively serious loss ; and they certainly compelled Hácon to desist for that season from farther undertakings, which in itself was a disaster ; but so much is evident, that even if the ships had not been damaged and the battle had not taken place, the king would nevertheless have been obliged to retreat, as he did, and to put off active hostilities for the winter. It is therefore quite true, what the Melrose Chronicle quotes as his own words, "that he was driven back not by human force but by the immediate influence of God." [a]

When it had been determined that no expedition should be undertaken to Ireland for the time being, the king held a meeting with his men, and declared that he would return to the other islands, because

prevent them from burying them near the church of Largs, still we cannot agree with Mr. Dillon in the supposition that they did bury them there, as it is expressly stated that the bodies were sent for from the fleet, and consequently taken on board the ships, to be buried elsewhere ; no doubt, as we have mentioned, in the Island of Bute. [In the *Times* of December 26, 1873, there is a letter from John S. Phene, F.S.A., dated from Skelmorlie, on the Clyde, near Largs, stating the results of an excavation he had just concluded, "which may fairly," he adds, "set at rest all question as to the whereabouts of the remains of the fallen invaders in the battle of Largs ; which has often been erroneously assigned to the much more ancient, indeed prehistoric, cairns, kists, and interments of the surrounding locality." This conclusion he forms from a comparison of the locality of the mound he excavated, and the details of the examination, with the accounts left by the older writers of the circumstances of the interment, and with the description given by Warsäæ of the two mounds on the mainland, opposite the north point of Cumbrae, which that Danish antiquarian considers to be the most remarkable in Scotland, in one of which the Scots, and in the other the Norsemen, were buried after the battle.]

[a] [Robertson says that as the Scots were enabled to carry off all their dead without molestation, either their victory must have been far more complete than the Norsemen chose to admit, or their loss must have been comparatively trivial ; ii. 94.]

provisions were scarce ;[a] he gave even some of the troops permission to return home to Norway, of which they were not slow to avail themselves. He left Lamlash about the 9th, passed the first night under Arran, the second under Sandey, the third under Gigha, and came on the 12th to Isla Sound, where he passed two nights, levying a contribution from the islanders of 360 cattle, or their value, part of which was to be paid in meal and cheese. On Sunday, the 14th of October, he continued his course, but a violent tempest, accompanied by dense mists, forced him to seek shelter in the harbour of Kerrera. Here fresh negotiations passed between the king and Eogan, but without any effect; Eogan did not even present himself; and it was soon announced that his men had committed ravages in the Isle of Mull, and killed some men, natives as well as Norwegians. Now, then, Eogan had finally declared himself for King Alexander. King Hácon did not, it appears, attempt to take any revenge, nor is it likely that it had been possible then to do so.

From Kerrera the king sailed to the Calf of Mull, where King Dugald and his brother Alan Mac Rory took their leave ; the king invested them with the lands formerly held by Eogan ; moreover, he assigned to Dugald the castle of Donaverty in Kentire ; to Rory he gave Bute, and to Murchard Arran. These were certainly not the acts of a vanquished monarch, and the Saga adds justly, that in this expedition King Hácon had regained the territories which King Magnus Barefoot had gained from Scotland and the Sudreys. The King of Man, with the other Sudreyans, had returned home before this time. After a stay of some few days the king left the Calf of Mull and proceeded to Rona, whence he took a northerly course, but was compelled by contrary winds to take shelter for several days in Westernfirth (Loch Snizort), in Skye, whose inhabitants therefore were forced to contribute provisions. At last he was able to continue his course, and passed Cape Wrath, but off Diurness he was becalmed (October 27), and entered a firth, called *Gjáfjorðr*, no doubt Loch Eribol, where seven of his men, who had gone on shore to fetch water, fell into an ambush and were killed. On Monday (October 29), he crossed the Pentland Firth to Ronaldsvoe, losing a ship in the Swelchie. When he arrived at the Orkneys he found that the greater part of the ships had returned home to Norway, many without leave. He now determined to pass the winter at Orkney with twenty ships and all the barons, giving the rest leave to go home. Accordingly, he had the ships put on shore at Midland harbour and Scalpa in the mainland, and took his residence

[a] The Chronicle of Melrose speaks also of "mortality" (meaning no doubt diseases) among the troops ; very likely it may be right.

in the palace of Bishop Henry at Kirkwall. Here he was taken sick from over-exerting himself. We refrain from giving the interesting history of his sickness and death, as not touching the present matter; suffice it to say that he died on the 15th of December, to the grief of all his subjects. In the following spring, as our Chronicle rightly says, his body was carried to Norway, and buried in the Cathedral of Bergen, named Christ Church, or Trinity Church.[a]

During his sickness King Hácon seems to have reflected seriously upon the expediency of continuing the war, and indeed to have come to the resolution that now, when the military glory of the nation was secured, an honourable and lasting peace was greatly to be preferred to a long and obstinate war. We learn, namely from the Saga, that early in the spring the barons and captains left by him in the Orkneys sent messengers to King Alexander "to look about them whether peace might be concluded." Fordun says that according to one tradition, Hácon before his death sent the letters which he had got from the malcontents in Scotland, to Alexander, with warnings against the traitors; this, however, the author himself thinks improbable, inclining rather to believe another tradition, that after King Hácon's death the Norwegians wrote to King Alexander a letter under the late king's seal, in which they warned him against certain magnates, hoping that he would punish them, and thereby weaken his own power, although

[a] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 326-330. We may add, however, for the benefit of those who speak of the "warlike" King Hácon as of a Viking of the old fashion, whose men were buried under cairns and cromlechs, or in true pagan style, that during his sickness he had the Bible and some legends read to him in Latin, until he found it too troublesome to follow the Latin text; then the Sagas of his ancestors were read in his own tongue. [But mortification, anxiety, and want of rest had done their work, and a mortal sickness seized upon the aged king, who had now filled the throne of Norway for the lengthened period of fifty-six years. Occasionally he rallied, arranging the affairs of his kingdom during the intervals of his disorder, and declaring Prince Magnus to be his only son and successor. To soothe the sleepless moments of the dying monarch the lives of the saints and the chronicles of the Kings of Norway were read by the side of his couch, but of all the accounts of the exploits of his predecessors, he best loved to listen to the deeds of his own grandfather, Sverre, the great leader of the Birkbeiner. At length he became speechless, and on the 15th of December (to use the simple language of the Norse writer)—"At midnight Almighty God called King Háco out of this mortal life." For three months the body lay in the church of St. Magnus, at Kirkwall, and as the winter passed away the sorrowing nobles bore the royal corpse to Norway, where, in obedience to the latest wishes of the dying king, his remains were deposited amidst the ashes of his predecessors in the Cathedral Church at Bergen. —Robertson, ii. 95.]

they were innocent, and the aspersion was without the least foundation.[a] This version, however, seems no more probable than the former; yet it is not unlikely that the Mission by which this letter was sent was the same as is spoken of in the Saga, especially as it is told that the messengers, Bishop Henry of Orkney, and Ascatine the royal chancellor, were very badly received; they were threatened, it is said, with death or imprisonment, and the Scots complained that the Norwegians had ravaged more than a third of Scotland. It is obvious that something more than the acts of open war must have taken place to exasperate the Scots so terribly; yet this whole affair is obscure, nor is it likely that it will ever be sufficiently explained. The messengers returned, and Sir Askatine went soon afterwards to Norway, whither also Sir Agmund Krokidans and Eric Dugaldsson had already repaired with some of the troops, reporting to the king that the Scots were far from being inclined to peace; whereon the king immediately sent Sir Agmund and Eric back to Orkney, the former to take the chief command of the forces in Orkney, the latter to proceed with three vessels to the Sudreys.

Meanwhile King Alexander prepared himself for the renewal of the war, and the cities, or some of them at least, furnished loans of money, which were spent not only in armaments, but also in bribes to several inhabitants of the Isles. The armament, it was said, was chiefly directed against King Magnus of Man, who, despairing of success while the Norwegian fleet was not at hand, sued for peace, and requested a safe-conduct that he might treat in person with King Alexander. The safe-conduct was granted, and King Alexander having repaired to Dumfries, Magnus met him there, and submitted entirely to him, declared himself to be his vassal, and tendered him the oath of allegiance, on condition that the Scottish king should protect him if the King of Norway sought to take revenge for this desertion; he promised, moreover, to furnish ten ships of war to the service of King Alexander. This is the relation of Fordun, which seems to be very accurate; according to our Saga,[b] the Scots really "went to Man and compelled King Magnus to oaths of submission;" considering, however, the particular circumstances, the difference is very slight, and amounts almost to nothing; from Dumfries to Man there is only a short distance, and if the Scottish fleet was assembled near Dumfries, which it certainly was, it is not unlikely that some of the ships should have shown themselves off Man to intimidate Magnus. It is curious that this whole transaction should not be mentioned by a single word in our Chronicle.

[a] Fordun, x. 16; also Wyntown, vii. x. 215-234.

[b] Saga of King Magnus, fragm. ch. 4.

King Alexander also sent a considerable number of forces, commanded by Earls William of Moray and Alexander of Buchan, as well as by Alan Durward, to reduce the other islands, and as there were none or few Norwegian troops to protect them, this enterprise was successful; Angus of Isla, the Saga says, and many others who had followed King Hácon the last year, now submitted to the Scots. Fordun adds that "those traitors at whose request King Hácon had come to the Isles, were now killed in battle, expelled, or hanged." Only King Dugald, the Saga relates, kept so well aloof on his ships that they did not get hold of him. Lastly, King Alexander sent troops to Caithness, whose inhabitants were made to pay a heavy fine for having yielded to the necessity when King Hácon compelled them to give contributions. This movement caused Sir Agmund, who dreaded an attack upon Orkney, to keep back Eric Dugaldson for the whole winter, with the ships and troops intended for the Sudreys, which no doubt greatly accelerated the progress of the enemy there. The Orkneys, however, were not attacked, and when the Scots returned from Caithness, King Dugald attacked them, killed many of them, and took a great deal of goods. In the next spring (1265) he came to Orkney soliciting aid, when his son Eric accompanied him with three ships, according to the royal order.

Meanwhile King Magnus, hearing from the Chancellor how matters stood, ordered him to return immediately as ambassador to King Alexander, accompanied by two Franciscan friars, one of whom was brother Maurice, who afterwards was employed in other diplomatic transactions with Scotland.[a] They went to Scotland as soon as possible, and got access to the king; they were also more friendly received than the former messengers, yet they did not get any other answer than this, that if King Magnus really wished for peace he ought to send "good messengers"[b] to Scotland next summer. Yet we learn from the Icelandic annals, compared with the Chamberlains Rolls, that Alexander indeed sent two Franciscan friars to Norway in the year 1264,[c] and it is very likely that these friars accompanied their Norwegian

[a] Chiefly the marriage-treaty of Roxburgh and Berwick 1281.—*Acts of Parl. of Scotland*, i.

[b] One of those "good messengers" being, as we see, Chancellor Ascatine, who had been so badly received when he went for the first time with Bishop Henry of Orkney, we must infer that King Alexander had particular objections to the latter.

[c] The Icelandic Annals say that Alexander sent two Franciscan friars to Norway in 1264; in the Chamberlains Rolls the expenses of friars Malise and Alexander of Berwick, "who went beyond the sea on the king's errand," are calculated at 37 sh. 1 d.—*Archæol. Scot.* ii. p. 39.

brethren, who arrived together with Sir Ascatine at Throndheim, where the king had passed Yule time, in the month of January 1265.

The king complied with the request of King Alexander, sufficient evidence of his eagerness for peace, and sent from Bergen, whither he had repaired after Easter time, bishop Gilbert of Hamar and Sir Ascatine,[a] both Scotchmen born, to Scotland, with full power to treat for peace on the conditions which had been rejected by King Hácon the previous year, viz. that the Scottish King should have the Isles inside of Kentire, while all the rest should continue to belong to Norway. The ambassadors took their route through England, where they landed at Lynn, and thence proceeded to York. Here they remained for a while, no doubt prevented from getting farther by the war between the barons and Prince Edward.[b] At last they penetrated into Scotland, and came to King Alexander; this monarch, however, who by that time must have pretty well completed the conquest of the Isles, treated their proposals with contempt, and insisted upon having all the islands.

The messengers now returned to Norway, yet King Alexander relaxed his obstinacy, in so far that he adopted a middle course, sending the eloquent Reginald of Roxburgh, monk in Melrose abbey, to Norway with the proposition to the king of selling Man and the Islands for a competent sum of money. This expedient had probably been concerted with the Norwegian ambassadors, who no doubt had likewise prepared their king for it, as it is related in the Melrose Chronicle, which here may be assumed as the most authentic record, that Reginald was honourably received, that King Magnus called his magnates together, to consult about the matter, and that he said *quod multum expediret pro pace servanda, ut venderentur insulæ regi Scottorum*,[c] to which some of the magnates objected, but that at last the opinion of the king was agreed to. These transactions, however, must have taken rather a long time, as Reginald did not return till the next year.

[a] Saga of King Magnus, ch. 4. Fordun, x. 19. The edition by Hearne has here, rightly, "*Rex Magnus misit Gilbertum episcopum de Hamar et suum Cancellarium*," [*King Magnus sent Gilbert, Bishop of Hamar and his Chancellor:*] which in the Goodall edition is wrongly given, "*R. M. misit suum Cancellarium dominum Gilbertum episcopum de Hamer*," [*King Magnus sent his Chancellor the lord Gilbert, bishop of Hamar,*] as if both were one person.

[b] In the Saga it is expressly said "they went first to England, to Lynn; at that time a great strife broke out in England, and Simon of Montfort was killed; the bishop and the chancellor then went to York, where they remained for a while."

[c] [*It would greatly conduce to the preservation of peace if the Islands were sold to the King of Scots.*]

The treaty, according to the Chronicle of Melrose, was already got up and agreed upon in Norway, and carried to Scotland by Chancellor Ascatine, who departed from Norway shortly after Reginald.[a] This, however, can only have been the preliminary record, as we learn from the final document, of which copies are still preserved, that it was written in Scotland after the arrival of the Norwegian ambassadors, and that these were, as usually, two, Chancellor Ascatine and Sir Andrew Nicholasson, the same who killed Sir Piers Curry in the battle of Largs. Of course the main contents of the treaty were already agreed upon in Norway, and the final transaction in Scotland was a mere formality, to obtain the ratification, yet the definitive record, written *in duplo*, one to be sealed by the Scottish king, and sent to Norway, the other, vice versa, to be sealed by the Norwegian king (the Chancellor had no doubt already brought with him a sealed blank for this purpose) and delivered up to King Alexander, dated at *Perth*, on Friday after the day of St. Peter and Paul, or July 2d, 1266.[b] As it has been often printed, we do not deem it necessary to give it here at length, referring those who want to peruse it from beginning to end, to *Acts of Parliaments of Scotland*, vol. i. p. 78, 101; Torfæi, *Orcades*, p. 198; his *Historia Norwegiæ*, iv. p. 343; Peterkin's *Rentals of Orkney;* Johnstone's *Antiq. Celto-Normannicæ*, p. 52, etc. It is sufficient to say that King Magnus ceded to King Alexander the Isle of Man and all the Sudreys, but not the Orkneys and Shetland, which were expressly excepted, without depriving the Norwegian archbishop of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction and metropolitan rights over Man and the Isles; Alexander promising in return that the crown of Scotland should perpetually pay to the crown of Norway, annually, 100 marks sterling, in the cathedral of Kirkwall, not later than the 1st of July; and, besides, a sum of 4000 marks sterling, by four instalments of a thousand each, in the years 1267, 1268, 1269, 1270, at the time and place aforesaid; finally, that a fine of 10,000 marks sterling was to be paid by the party

[a] Here the learned editor of the Bannatyne edition of the *Chronica de Mailros* has made a curious mistake. At the name of "*Reginaldus de Roxburgh*," he adds the following note:—"The Norwegian account of this expedition, published by Johnstone, says simply, p. 15, that an archdeacon (erkidjakn einn) was sent from Alexander, and gives a different colouring to the whole transaction." Now, these words about the archdeacon belong to the 367 chapter of King Hácon's Saga, where the embassy sent from King Alexander to King Hácon in 1261 is spoken of. The transactions between Alexander and Magnus in 1265-66 have no doubt been related in the Saga of King Magnus, of which fragments only are left, and the part in question is wanting.

[b] [See Appendix, No. 27.]

who violated or did not fulfil the treaty to the other; both submitting to the jurisdiction and ecclesiastical punishment of the apostolic See.[a]

Immediately after the conclusion of this treaty the Norwegian ambassadors, it appears, returned home, as we learn from the Icelandic annals that King Magnus published the treaty at a public meeting in the Christ-Churchyard in Bergen, on the day of St. Lawrence (August 10) the same year. In the inventory of the public records existing in the treasury of Edinburgh Castle, A.D. 1282, published in the *Acts of Parliament of Scotland*, p. i. preface, p. 3, we find among "*negotia tangentia Norwagiam*"[b] not only "*Compositio inter reges Scotiæ et Norwagiæ super insulis, duplicata*," i.e., the treaty itself, with a copy, but also "*Confessio procuratorum missorum a rege Norwagiæ pro dicta compositione facienda*," and farther "*mandatum regis Norwagiæ quod insulæ faciant homagium regi Scotiæ et ei intendant ut domino*,"[c] it appears, then, that King Magnus of Norway, as usual in such cases, had issued a document, in which he released his Sudreyan subjects from their allegiance, and transferred it to the King of Scots; no doubt the ambassadors brought this letter with them fully prepared under his seal.[d]

When the treaty was concluded, King Magnus of Man was already dead, as we see from our Chronicle,[e] yet King Alexander did not come

[a] The words in which the Melrose Chronicle gives the contents of this treaty are rather remarkable: "*cuius compositionis hæc est summa annua, scilicet quod rex Scotiæ omni anno in perpetuum dabit regi Norwagiæ centum libras sterlingorum pro cognitione homagii facti regi Norwagiæ a dicto Alexandro rege Scotiæ, qui ad majorem securitatem præ manibus pacavit regi Norwagiæ* 4000 *marcarum.* [*The annual amount under this agreement is that the King of Scotland shall pay for ever unto the King of Norway, each year, the sum of* £100 *sterling in recognition of homage done to the King of Norway by the said Alexander, King of Scotland, who for greater security paid into the hands of the Norwegian king the sum of* 4000 *marks.*]

[b] [*Matters touching Norway.*]

[c] [*An agreement between the Kings of Scotland and Norway, concerning the Isles, in duplicate.*]

[*Declaration of the procurators sent by the King of Norway to arrange the said agreement.*]

[*Command of the King of Norway that the Isles do homage to the King of Scotland, and comport themselves towards him as their lord.*]

[d] Among these *negotia tang. Norwagiam* also three other records, touching the Isles, are named, but which probably belong to the twelfth century, viz., a royal donation to Russin abbey, a royal letter about Bute and other islands, granted to the King of Man, and another royal letter about the islands Juist and Egyn (Eigg). [See a schedule of documents in Dr. Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 102.]

[e] In the Icelandic annals the decease of Magnus is wrongly referred to A.D. 1266, and by Fordun to 1267.

into possession of Man—if, indeed, he ever did—without difficulties. According to Fordun, who, however, wrongly assigns the death of King Magnus to A.D. 1267, King Alexander in this year collected an army against the "rebels" of Man, with the intention of establishing his camp there; yet he altered this plan, and sent only some of his troops, with the Galwegians.[a] The result is not mentioned; but there can be no doubt that we have it somehow given in the titles of two letters, mentioned in the aforesaid inventory, viz., a letter to King Alexander from the "*Majores*" of Man, no doubt a limited and conditional submission, and an obligation of Alexander to the bishop of Man "*quod non iret super Manniam ad tempus*,"[b] evidently the condition on which the Manx magnates agreed to acknowledge him for their liege lord.

King Alexander probably now exacted oaths of allegiance from the Sudreyans in general, and especially from those magnates who had not yet submitted to him. Among the last to do so, it appears, was Angus of Isla; because, from the same inventory, we learn that the barons of Argyll pledged themselves, under the loss of their hereditary domains, to aid the king faithfully against Angus if he did not obey the king's commands, and that Angus was compelled to issue an obligation, tendering forfeiture of his patrimonial domains, if he failed in his duty towards the king. Afterwards, however, we find him among the magnates of Scotland at the Parliament of Scone, 1283 (*Acts of Parl.* i. p. 82). His descendants, the Mac Donalds, were likewise a powerful clan. Whether King Dugald Mac Rory did homage to King Alexander is not known; from the Icelandic annals we learn that he died in 1268, and it is very likely that he passed these last two years after the cession in Norway, since his death is noticed by the Icelandic annalist, and since his son, Sir Eric Dugaldson, continued to live in Norway as a baron, till his death in 1287.[c] The brother of Dugald, however, Alan Mac Rory, submitted to the King of Scots; he appears as *Alanus filius Roderici* among the barons of the Parliament of Scone, 1283.[d]

[a] [Robertson says that in 1268 Alexander collected an army in Galloway with the intention of again reducing the islanders who appear to have shaken off his authority for a short time; but that the continued prevalence of tempestuous weather prevented the projected invasion; ii. 103.]

[b] [*That he should not go to Man for a time.*]

[c] It is worth while to observe that in the Saga of King Magnus, written about 1270, Dugald is no more styled king, but only Lord Dugald. The title had evidently been antiquated, or dropped.

[d] [In a fragment, from Torfæus of a Chronicle, given by Johnstone, *Antiq. Celt.-Norm.*, p. 55, the treaty is related to have been resumed in 1312, by Háco and

After the conclusion of this treaty the Norwegian dominion over Man and the Isles ceased entirely, and no formal attempt was made to gain it back, although it would seem that the wish was not entirely given up, especially by the son and successor of King Magnus, *Eric*, who possibly married the daughter of Alexander chiefly for this purpose.[a] Yet we learn from our Chronicle, as well as from Fordun, and the title of the above mentioned documents, that the dominion of Alexander in the Isle of Man must have been rather loose and much disputed by the natives themselves. Indeed, the island seems never to have been formally united with Scotland, but only to have been held by Alexander and his successors as a personal possession, which afterwards facilitated its transference to the Crown of England. Of this, however, it is superfluous and beyond our scope to treat here. We learn from the Chronicle of Lanercost, although, by a singular mistake, it mentions the cession of Man during A.D. 1256, while the battle of Largs is spoken of during A.D. 1266, that King Alexander really, for a time at least, had bailiffs or lieutenants in Man. The article being curious, and somehow a supplement to our Chronicle, we give it here at length: *Eodem anno* (1256), *adhuc Ywaro* (the assassin of Reginald; here, however, King Magnus is evidently meant) *Manniam gubernante, translatum est regnum Manniæ et Insularum ad Alexandrum regem, filium Alexandri regis Scotorum, ex consensu et bona voluntate Magni regis Norwegiæ filii Haconis, conventione tamen de annuali censu reddendo regi Norvegiæ et heredibus suis. Rex autem constituit ballivos suos in Mannia, quorum primus fuit Godredus Mac Mares,*[b] *post hunc Alanus filius Comitis, post*

Robert at Inverness. If this statement be correct, it would scarcely be probable that the arrangement was as effective as it is represented to have been in the following lines of the note. See Oliver's *Mon.* iii. 217, n, 1. In 1426 James I. of Scotland concluded a treaty with Eric, King of Denmark, *l.c.* p. 218, in which were renewed the ancient alliances entered into between Alexander III., Robert I., and the princes who in their day occupied the Northern throne. James also consented to continue the annual payment of 100 marks for the sovereignty of the little kingdom of Man and the Western Isles, which Alexander III. had purchased in 1266, for the sum of 4000 marks.]

[a] In the marriage-treaty of Roxburgh and Berwick, A.D. 1281, King Alexander pledged the Isle of Man as security for the payment of the fine (£100,000 st.) in case of his not fulfilling the stipulations. [See the treaty or covenant of marriage between Eric, King of Norway, and Margaret, daughter of Alexander, King of Scots, in Dr. Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 96.]

[b] [Robertson supposes Mac Mara to be a lineal descendant of the Mac Mara who led the Southern Manxmen to their desperate contest with Jarl Other, and the Northerns at Sandwath, in the days of Magnus Barefoot. He thinks that he represented the Gaelic element as opposed to the Scoto-Norwegian, for the antagonism between them no doubt extended from the north and west of Scotland

hunc Mauricius Okarefair, post hunc Reginaldus capellanus domini regis.[a]

That Magnus of Man was married to a daughter of Eogan of Argyle, and that she afterwards married Malise, Earl of Stratherne, has been already mentioned. We can hardly think this connection with Eogan to have been without influence upon Magnus in hastening his submission to King Alexander in 1264, as also, perhaps, in making his fidelity to King Hácon, rather shaky already in 1263, when Eogan had declared himself peremptorily for Alexander.

NOTE 53, p. 110.—*Anno d.* 1275.

According to the Chronicle of Lanercost the expedition here mentioned was caused by a new rebellion of the Manxmen, who had taken Godred, the son of Magnus, for their king. We give the entry at length, as a supplement to our Chronicle: *Hoc anno* (1275) *septima die mensis Octobris, applicuit navigium regis Scotiæ in portu de Reynaldsway. Statim dominus Johannes de Vesci*[b] *et optimates regis cum exercitibus suis in insulam Sti Michaelis ascendebant, Mannensibus paratis ad proelium, cum Godredo filio Magni, quem paullo ante regem constituerant sibi. Magnates vero et capitanei regis Scotiæ legationem pacis ad Godredum et populum Manniæ transmiserunt, pacem dei et regis Scotiæ eidem offerentes, si a stultissima præsumtione sua desisterent, et se ultro regi et optimatibus suis dederent. Godredo autem et perversis quibusdam consiliariis suis legationi pacis non consentientibus, sequenti die ante solis ortum, cum adhuc tenebræ esset super terram, et corda stultorum hominum obtenebrata essent, conflictus factus est, et miseri Mannenses terga vertentes miserabiliter corruerunt.*[c] If Godred, as it would seem, was among the slain, the male line of the Godredian dynasty expired in his person. The

to Man. Man remained in the king's hands, administered by his bailiffs or thanes, till Robert I. gave it to Thomas Randolph. The Nordreys, which had continued under the Kings of Man, after Somerled had acquired the Sudreys, fell to the Earl of Ross; ii. 104.]

[a] [*In the same year* (1256), *whilst Ivar still ruled over Man, the kingdom of Man and the Isles was given up to King Alexander, son of Alexander, King of the Scots, with the consent and goodwill of Magnus, King of Norway, on condition, however, of an annual payment to the King of Norway, and his heirs. The king, moreover, appointed his bailiffs in Man, the first of whom was Godred Mac Mara, then Alan, the son of the Count, after him Maurice Okarefair, after him Reginald, chaplain of the king.*]

[b] This Johannes de Vescy is called in the *Chron. de Mailros*, A.D. 1268, "*dominus burgi de Alnewike*" [*Lord of the burgh of Alnwick*], and founder of the Premonstratensian Monastery of Alnwick.

[c] [*Upon the 7th of October* (1275), *the fleet of the King of Scotland put into*

female line seems to have survived for one generation more, for in the year 1293 one Affreca, related to the last king, Magnus, and pretending to be his legal heir, claimed the Isle of Man, as we learn from a letter issued June 15, 1293, by King Edward I. to John Baliol, then King of Scotland, citing him as a vassal of the English crown, to appear before his court, and receive judgment in the same case.[a] It must be added that the Island had been lately made over by Edward to King John (see letter dated January 5, 1293, Rymer, *Fœd.* i. 9. p. 785), the inhabitants having three years before (Rymer, l. c. p. 740) of their own free will put themselves under the protection of King Edward.[b] This Affreca was no doubt a grand-daughter of her namesake, the daughter of King Godred, mentioned heretofore (p. 80, ad. ann. 1204) on her marriage with John de Courcy, and named after his grandmother, as she again, in her turn, was named after her grandmother, Affreca of Galloway, King Olaf's Queen (vide p. 60, ad ann. 1102). What was the issue of the lawsuit we do not know; nor do we think it necessary to dwell on the entries in our Chronicle for the years 1313 and 1316, as being sufficiently explicit to want any explanation.[c]

the port of Ronaldsway. John de Vesci and the king's nobles immediately landed their forces on the island of St. Michael, the people of Man being prepared for the encounter, along with Godred, the son of Magnus, whom they had made their king but a short time previously. The chiefs and officers of the King of Scotland, however, sent an embassy of peace to Godred and the people of Man, offering to them the peace of God and of the King of Scotland, on condition of their laying aside their absurd presumption, and of giving themselves up to the king and his nobles. As Godred, however, and some of his perverse counsellors did not agree to the terms of the embassy, on the following day, before sunrise, whilst darkness still covered the earth, and the hearts of foolish men were darkened, an engagement took place, and the unfortunate people of Man running away, fell miserably.]

[a] [Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 127. Under date 1219, King Henry III. orders G. de Marischal, Justice of Ireland, to pay the dower of Affrica, wife of John de Courcy. —Oliver, ii. 48. Under date 1291, Maria, Queen of Man, does homage to Edward I. in Galloway; *ib.* ii. 115. Can this Mary be Reginald's daughter, through whom John Waldebœf claimed the throne of Man in 1305? ii. 135. There was also Mary, Reginald's wife, who afterwards became Countess of Strathern.]

[b] [Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 110 and 125.]

[c] [March, 25, 1305.—Affreca issued a notice that she had conceded all her rights on Man to Simon de Montacute. June 28, 1307.—Edward I. seems to have resumed possession of Man. May 1, 1308.—Edward II. granted it to Henry de Bello Monte (Beaumont); but this grant seems to have been illegal, as contrary to a document signed on the 16th of March previous, so that the king, in 1310, revoked the concession, and ordered it to be delivered into the hands of Gilbert Makaskel (Mac Askel, seneschal of Anthony Bec, Bishop of Durham), and Robert de Leiburn, Constable of Cockermouth. He named Simon de

NOTE 54, p. 112.—*Hi fuerunt episcopi, etc.*

When comparing the list of the bishops given here with those mentioned by English annalists and in the Icelandic annals, we perceive in the beginning a difference of statements, sufficient to make it evident

Montague, then in the Isle of Man, to be admiral of the fleet against Scotland. December 15, 1311.—Edward II. orders the sheriffs and bailiffs of Cheshire, Lancashire, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, to assist Gilbert Makasky, seneschal of Anthony Bek, Bishop of Durham, with victuals and other necessaries for the navy, in order to enable him to defend the same against Robert Bruce, his enemy, and a traitor. On the following day he signifies that malefactors from the Isle of Man, partisans of Bruce, are committing devastations on England, whom they must seize and put in prison. In 1312 he orders Gilbert Makaskill to pay over to Gilbert de Bromley, his receiver at Carlisle, the moneys he had received on account of Henry de Bello Monte in Man. On the 18th of June, in the same year, 1312, he warns all his bailiffs against allowing any injury to be committed against his faithful subjects of the Isle of Man. In the same year he renews his grant of the land of Man, with knights' fees, and other appurtenances, and royal command to Henry de Bello Monte for his life; but the Parliament annulled the grant and removed Henry from the king's council and the royal person.—Dr. Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 137-162. In June 1313, Robert Bruce takes Rushen Castle (Chron. 1313), and in December of the same year (if the year assigned to the document be correct, though it does not agree with the date of the document), he grants the Isle of Man to his nephew Thomas Randolph, Earl of Moray, to be held by the service of finding six ships of twenty-six oars each, with their crews, victualled for five weeks when required, and making personal appearance in Parliament when duly summoned. His immediate descendants quartered the arms of the island; and his grandson and heir general, the celebrated George Dunbar, son of the famous Black Agnes of Dunbar, bore on his shield the arms of Man as well as of the Bruces.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 162; *N.* and *Q.* 4 S. iv. September 4; and 4 S. v. January 29; and 4 S. iv. November 13.

July 6, 1317.—Edward II. instructed John de Athy, keeper of the Land of Man, to provide three ships, properly armed and victualled, for its defence against the Scots.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 169.

In 1328 a peace was concluded between England and Scotland, by which the two kings agreed to be good friends and faithful allies, and in the event of rebellion against England in the kingdom of Ireland, or against Scotland in Man, Skye, or the other islands, not to abet or assist their rebel subjects.—Tytler, i. 404-5; Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 176.

In 1329, King Edward III. appointed master Edward Mortayn, escheator of Ireland, and his brother John Tyrel, as his lieutenant, to lead the men for the expulsion of the Scotch felons, who had entered the island with Richard de Maundevill, for the purpose of conquering it.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 178.

On the 30th of May, 1334, Edward III. requested all knights, freemen, and others, tenants in the Isle of Man, to assist William le Taillour of Carlisle, Haver Macoter, and Gilbert Makstephan, in the seizure and safe keeping of the Isle of Man. And on the 8th of June he notifies that he has entrusted it for one year

that indeed sometimes there have been two or three bishops at once."[a] As for "Roolwer" (*Hrólfr*), whose name shows him to have been of Norwegian origin, and his three successors, of whom nothing more is known than what is said here, they stand without rivals, the other records not mentioning any bishop so far back. The first mentioned in the Icelandic annals is Ragnaldus or Reginald (*Reinardus*) whose death is recorded for the year 1170 ; but while our Chronicle makes Reginald to be succeeded by Christinus of Argyll, Christinus by Michael, who died 1193 (p. 80), and Michael by Nicholas, who died 1217 (p. 82), the

to William de Montacute. And on the 9th of August he renounces all further claim to the Island in favour of the same.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 180, 182, 183.

On the 28th of August 1343, Edward III. orders his Justice of Ireland to make inquiry into the seizure of certain vessels of Man on their way to Scotland with certain moneys, cattle, and goods, covenanted to be paid, with the consent of William de Montacute, Earl of Salisbury, and Lord of the Island, for one year's peace with Scotland. On the 24th of September the king, Edward III. grants leave to his subjects of the Isle of Man, to treat with the Scots, and to make truces or treaties with them, as circumstances may demand, without let or hindrance from his bailiffs or servants.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 192, 196. In 1355 a truce is made between Edward III. and Sir David de Bruys, which comprises the Isle of Man, as well as England and Scotland.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 198. In the year 1357, the said truces are reaffirmed and renewed.—*Mon.* ii. 199, 201. In the year 1375, Robert Bruce, King of the Scots, grants to James Douglas, Knight, Lord of Dalkeith, and to his sister Agnes of Dunbar, whom the said James was marrying, and to their heirs in fee, one hundred librates of land (5000 acres) in the Island of Man, in a suitable place, if, within forty days, they could gain possession of the same by war, peace, or agreement.—*Mon.* ii. 203.

We have given this summary of the vicissitudes in the history of the Isle of Man subsequent to the year 1316, with which the civil portion of the Chronicle closes, in order to bring the narrative down to the period to which the account of ecclesiastical events is extended.]

[a] [This conjectural solution of the chronological difficulty does not seem probable. It is against the express testimony of the Chronicle, and includes the very unlikely hypothesis that the Chronicle would have omitted mention of such a remarkable occurrence had it happened, whilst we find it on various occasions relating the difficulties that attended the appointment of the bishops of the Island, though of much less moment. Moreover, this very unusual abuse of two or three rival bishops, is supposed by the conjecture to have been repeated on sundry occasions within a very short period, including that immediately following the new arrangement of the ecclesiastical province, when we should imagine matters to have been conducted with more than usual attention to rights and rule, whilst so many interested parties were looking on, and Rome, as appears from some of the documents in the Appendix, seems to have entered so much into the details of the ecclesiastical management of the Island. Perhaps Professor Munch has been misled by his theory of a standing contest between Nidaros and York respecting the Sodor See, for which there appears no foundation in the facts alleged, as we shall see later.]

Icelandic annals say expressly, that after the death of Reginald there was no bishop for forty years, when, A.D. 1210, a bishop was consecrated, named *Koli*. In some manuscripts of the annals "Reinardus" is corrupted into "Nemar," and it is even recorded that this Nemar was taken prisoner. On the other side, we learn from Stubb's *Acta pontiff. Eboracens.* (Twysden, p. 1217), compared with Matthew of Paris, William of Newbury, etc., that Wimund, the same who afterwards stepped forth as a pretender to the Scottish crown, under the name of Malcolm Mac Heth, but being then priest in Skye, was consecrated bishop by Thomas, Archbishop of York, who died A.D. 1114; and that he was succeeded by John, a monk from Savigny [a] (Matthew Paris, p. 60); John, as it appears from King Olaf's letters, printed in the Appendix, Nos. 3 and 4, being again succeeded by a Nicholas,[b] a monk in the abbey of Furness, about 1130, as it is to Archbishop Thurstan (1119-1139) that King Olaf applies for his consecration, while the monastery itself had existed only since A.D. 1126. It appears, therefore, that Wimund, John, and Nicholas, must have been contemporary with William and Gamaliel, perhaps even with Reginald mentioned in our Chronicle; and that Christinus, Michael, and Nicholas of our Chronicle, were contemporary with the long vacancy and Koli of the Icelandic annals,

[a] [John, a monk of Seez in Normandy, succeeded Wimund, according to Matthew Paris, in 1151. He was consecrated by Henry Murdach, who was Archbishop of York from 1147-1153. Possibly he may have been Bishop of Whithern, though the Rev. W. Stubbs considers that he is erroneously so-called in the metrical history of York, yet the omission of his name in the Manx Chronicle, and the assertion of the metrical writer, ought to outweigh Matthew Paris.

"But Candida Casa owned York for her mother,
Her reverenced she ever, and reverenced no other,
No church in all Scotland is older or whiter,
But the fame of her saints shines, if possible, brighter;
What tongue can recite, or what memory learn
The roll of the saints that have hallowed Whithern?
Father Roger ordained Gamaliel for one
And Henry performed the same office for John."

—Cotton MS., *Cleopatra*, c. 4.

In Dr. Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 111, may be seen the bull of Pope Eugenius III. in 1152 (1153), confirming the gift of Olave of Man of certain lands to the abbey of Furness. At the survey made 26 Henry viii. the tithes of the churches in Man appertaining to Furness are set down at £6 : 13 : 4.—West's *Furness*, pp. 107-8.]

[b] [Munch is commonly thought to err in attributing the dispute about the consecration of Nicholas to the reign of Olave I. It belongs to Olave II., nearly a hundred years later. Many of the difficulties which Munch fails to solve arise from this error.]

whom we believe to be the same as Nicholas (this name being sometimes abridged to Colas, Claus, etc.).

This confusion is to be regarded as a product of many factors. To resolve the riddle, it is first of all necessary to distinguish between the period before the erection of the metropolitan see of Nidarós by the bull[a] of Pope Anastasius IV., in 1154, when the Sudreys were expressly annexed to this province as a suffragan diocese, and the times subsequent to the said bull. Before this arrangement, Man at least was evidently regarded as belonging to the province of York, and perhaps also the other Isles, as, indeed, was the whole of Scotland, at least according to the pretensions of the Archbishop of York; but it is very probable that Man and the Isles had not always one bishop in common, but either of them one of their own;[b] and moreover, that here, as in Norway before 1111, no distinct bishoprics with fixed residences existed; but that the bishops were only ambulatory, or court-bishops. From the letter of Pope Innocent IV., which we have reprinted in the Appendix, No. 19, we see that the monks of Furness abbey, in Lancashire asserted the right of electing the bishops of Man from their own number, which right may be they founded upon the agreement recorded in the letter of King Olaf I., which we have given in the Appendix, No. 3, although, from the fact that previous to the election here spoken of one bishop at least was taken from the monastery of Savigny, the mother of Furness, the right of election seems already to have been exerted by this monastery, and to have been transferred to the daughter abbey, when that was founded in 1126.

It is, however, very probable that the agreement mentioned in the aforesaid letter was never meant to establish a general rule for the time to come, but only to arrange the election for the present occasion, and the election of Wimund and John had been arranged in a similar manner,—a connection, the cause of which we do not presume to investigate, having evidently sprung up between Savigny abbey and the royal family of Man; and that the king and people never thought of giving up their right of electing the bishop in common, since indeed, as we shall see by and by, they asserted that right even in later days, and with final success. Now it is very likely that the

[a] [See Appendix, No. 5.]

[b] From the letter of Innocent IV., issued A.D. 1247, to a chieftain in Kentire (Appendix, No. 20), we learn that then the diocese of Argyle was called *diocesis Lismorensis;* Lismore being one of the Isles, it is not unlikely that the diocese comprehended some more of these in former times. [It was not so. Lismore diocese was formed out of the bishopric of Dunkeld.]

Archbishop of York, declaring this manner of election to be uncanonical, pretended that the right of election belonged to himself and his chapter, because Man had no chapter of its own, and that he even made use of this right: indeed, the letter of King Olaf to the chapter of York (Appendix, No. 4), alludes evidently to an unwillingness on the part of the latter to acknowledge the election of Nicholas. We think, therefore, that Gamaliel,[a] who must have been contemporary with John and Nicholas, was named by Archbishop Thurstan, especially, as he is expressly said to have been an Englishman, and buried at Peterborough, while Wimund, being formerly priest in Skye, was rather bishop of the Isles, and not of Man.

When the metropolitan see at Nidaros was erected, the pretensions of the Archbishop of York as to the jurisdiction over Man and the Isles must necessarily have come to an end, or ought at least to have been cancelled, while it appears that the archbishop and chapter of Nidaros now asserted the right of electing the bishops to all those suffragan sees of the province which had no chapters of their own, viz. Skalaholt, and Hólar in Iceland, Garðar in Greenland, the Færeys, and of course also the Sudreys, which right, indeed, it succeeded in establishing in the four first-named dioceses, where hitherto, at least in Iceland, the election[b] had been used to be effected almost in the same manner as in Man. In the Isles this pretension must evidently have occasioned new differences.

The fact that Ragnald[c] or Reginald was a Norwegian, and is mentioned first of all the Sudreyan bishops in the Icelandic annals, shows

[a] [Gamaliel succeeded John, being consecrated by Roger de Pont l'Eveque in 1154. His obit was kept at Peterborough, July 13 (*Mon. Ang.* ii. 362). Roger was Archbishop of York from 1154-81. As Pope Anastasius IV. in 1154 made Man dependent on Nidaros, the consecration of Gamaliel probably took place before the Pope's bull came into operation. In Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 13, will be found a renewal by Godred of the charter of Olave, conferring on Furness the right of electing the Bishop of Man and the Isles.]

[b] [An archbishop had not usually the election of his suffragans, though they were bound to seek consecration at his hands. At present the Pope allows a bishop to select his own consecrator, who must, however, be in communion with the Holy See.]

[c] [Reginald, Ronald, or Nemar, was most likely consecrated in Norway. Cumming assigns him to 1181, and supposes him to have been the first Bishop of Man consecrated by the archbishop of Drontheim; but the Icelandic Chronicle places his death in 1170, or forty years previous to 1210, the year given for the consecration of Claus, Koli, or Nicholas. The date of the bull of Anastasius IV. fixes that of the foundation of the See, December 1, 1154. William the Lion of Scotland, in 1166, came to Mount St. Michael, and with him the Bishop of Man and

clearly that his nomination was due to the authority of the Nidrosian see, and that we ought to date it from A.D. 1152, when the see was founded, and all these matters arranged by Cardinal Nicholas Breakspear, afterwards to be sanctioned by the papal bull. And when we remember, what has been shown before, that just at that time King Godred was in Norway, suing for support, and submitting himself and his possessions entirely to the Norwegian crown, which indeed was evidently the cause why the Sudreyan see was made a suffragan to that of Nidaros, we may easily account for the fact that the authority or pretensions of this see were then acknowledged and obeyed for the nonce, and it is even very probable that Godred himself brought Reginald out with him when he returned to Man in 1153. The statement that Reginald made an important arrangement with his flock about the episcopal revenues, seems also, somehow, to bear witness that he exercised no small degree of influence, and probably enjoyed the protection of the king. Yet when Godred was expelled by Somerled of Argyll in 1158, it is very likely that Reginald shared his fate, and followed him to Norway,[a] which supposition is greatly corroborated and grows almost to certainty by the fact expressly stated in our Chronicle, that Christinus[b] who is said to have succeeded him, was an Argyle-man, evidently a protégé of Somerled, and introduced by this usurper. It is not very likely that Christinus was consecrated by the archbishop of York; he must rather be supposed to have come from Ireland, since he was buried at Benchor Abbey, in Ulster, of which he probably was a monk. Of course, under these circumstances, Christinus could not be acknowledged as the right bishop by the Norwegians, and this accounts for his not being mentioned in the annals. We are rather inclined to think that Reginald did not return from Norway, but remained there till his death in 1170.

thirty-one other islands, which the King of the Isles holds of the King of Norway, by the payment of ten marks of gold to every new king. No other payment is made during the life of that king, or until the appointment of a successor.—Robertson, i. 363, n.]

[a] If there is some truth in the above-mentioned statement, found in some manuscripts of the Icelandic annals, that Reginald, or, as he is called, Nemar, was taken prisoner, this corroborates our opinion; it being then evident that he was taken prisoner by Somerled, who perhaps afterwards permitted him to go to Norway, on the condition of not returning to the Isles.

[b] [There was a Christian who presided over the see of Whithern from 1154-1186; but this cannot be the same, though Mr. Stubbs (*Reg. Sac. Ang.*) once supposed so. In Cumming and Hardy's *Le Neve* he is erroneously styled an Orkney man; he was of Argyll—Archadiensis, not Orchadiensis.]

When Christinus then, as we do not doubt, was in his turn expelled by Godred after the fall of Somerled, it is to be supposed that Godred, who did not care much for his allegiance to Norway when not pressed by sheer necessity, proceeded to arrange an election after the old fashion, since it is expressly stated that Michael, the elected, was a native of Man. There can be no doubt that he was consecrated by the Archbishop of York, from his being buried at Fountain Abbey,[a] to which congregation he must have belonged; and this circumstance explains very well why he too was not acknowledged by the Norwegians or mentioned in the Icelandic annals. He is said in our Chronicle to have died A.D. 1193, yet as the same year is also affixed to the preceding entry about the captivity of King Richard, there is a strong presumption that the repetition is wrong, and that we ought to read 1203, especially as it is immediately followed by an entry of A.D. 1204. In this case, the bishop who is said in the Saga of Bishop Gudmund to have been with King Olaf in one of the islands south of Lewis, when Gudmund and Rafn Sveinbjarnarson arrived there in 1202 on their way to Norway, must have been this Michael; if, however, Michael died in 1193, that bishop was his successor Nicholas. Yet as Nicholas, like Christinus, was an Argyle-man, and was buried at Benchor, in Ireland, we are rather inclined to think that he belonged to this monastery,[b] and that his nomination happened during the affairs which King Reginald had with Ireland in 1204 and 1205. As there can scarcely be any doubt that he was the identical person who is called Koli in the Icelandic annals, his consecration, we see must have been deferred till A.D. 1210, and it must have been celebrated by the Norwegian archbishop, or with his permission, because otherwise he would hardly have been mentioned in the said annals, or acknowledged as bishop, more than his predecessors, the episcopates of whom are regarded as a blank of

[a] [It does not follow either that Michael was a monk of Fountains, or that he was consecrated at York, because he was buried at Fountains: he was, no doubt, a Cistercian. Cumming makes him succeed in 1195; but the Chronicle makes him die in 1193, which a marginal note corrects to 1203. In 1186, Pope Urban III. confirmed to Furness the grants, privileges, alms, and dignities conferred by Stephen and Henry of England, and by the kings of the Isles (Olave and Godred?) —Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 15. In 1188, Reginald, son of Godred, King of Man, confirmed to Furness the charter of his grandfather Olave, conferring on that monastery the right of electing from its inmates the bishop of Man and the Isles.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 17.]

[b] [This conjecture is erroneous, for the annals of the abbey of Meaux (Melsa) recently published under the authority of the Master of the Rolls, show him to have been first a monk of that monastery, subsequently Abbot of Furness, and lastly Bishop of Man and the Isles.]

forty years.[a] It was no doubt chiefly on account of the confusion here mentioned,[b] that Pope Innocent III., at the request of Archbishop Eric of Nidaros, issued a brief in the month of February A.D. 1205, by which he declared that the bishops who belonged to the province of Nidaros ought to be consecrated by him and his successors only, and by no other bishop, except when the metropolitan See was vacant, yet even then not without the consent of the Nidrosian chapter; the suffragan Sees subjected to that of Nidaros being, besides the four in Norway proper, those of the Orkneys, Sudreys, Færeys, Iceland, and Greenland.[c]

[a] [This reasoning is not conclusive. Nicholas was a man of mark: his attendance at the general council, the fourth of Lateran under Innocent III., in 1215, and his exile from his See, may have made him better known than his predecessors. Besides it is difficult to account for the omission of some facts, and the entry of others of less importance, in the annals of any country.]

[b] [More likely the Pope issued the bull not to prevent but to correct an irregularity; possibly the difficulty of obtaining consecration for Nicholas at York may have arisen from the bull.]

[c] [The episcopate of Nicholas fell in evil days. In Man and the Isles there existed a feeling of bitter hostility between Olave and Reginald, which eventually broke out into civil war, ending in the death of Reginald. In Norway the Archbishop of Drontheim was compelled to seek safety by flight from the vengeance of Swerro, and though recalled by Hako III., yet the country continued a prey to civil dissension, which came to an end only in 1241. The difficult chronology of this episcopate almost leads to the belief that there must have been two bishops bearing the name of Nicholas. Under date 1193, the Chronicle records the death of Michael, and adds that Nicholas succeeded him; but it does not follow that he succeeded immediately, and Munch and others suppose that the date ought to be 1203: Beck suggests even 1213. Under date 1193, Dr. Oliver (*Mon.* ii. 19) gives a charter of Nicholas, Bishop of the Isles, in which he makes known his election by the monks of Furness, to whom the right of election has been granted by Kings of the Isles, and confirmed by Popes; but the charter is without date. In May 23, 1194, Pope Celestine III. renews his confirmation of the Furness Charter, possibly because some outcry had been raised against the election of Bishop Nicholas.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 21. Dr. Oliver gives a receipt by Bishop Nicholas, on his return from the general council, of various pontifical utensils and vestments surrendered by Nicholas, Abbot of Furness, according to the will of Michael, his predecessor.—(*Mon.* ii. 38.) Now this document, if genuine, suggests strange doubts. There was only one abbot of Furness called Nicholas with the addition of Melsa or Meaux, who himself was then, or became subsequently, Bishop of Man; yet here we have Nicholas the Bishop of Man, acknowledging the receipt of certain articles from Nicholas the abbot, so that, at that time, there must have been two persons of the name of Nicholas, the bishop and the abbot. Oliver (*Mon.* ii. 38) dates this letter 1193, but it must have been after the general council held at the Lateran in 1215, which was attended also by Walter, Bishop of Glasgow, by Brice, Bishop of Moray, and Adam, Bishop of Caithness. Nicholas is said by the Chronicle to have died in 1217; and on the authority of a MS. of Brown Willis, West says that Nicholas

This declaration, however, was not observed for any length of time, as already Reginald,[a] who succeeded Nicholas in 1217, was no doubt

de Meaux, 17th Abbot of Furness, was translated from the abbacy of Furness to the bishopric of the Sudreys in 1217, that is, after the death of the first Nicholas; for it is absurd to suppose, with Hardy's *Le Neve*, that the Chronicle, by the word *obiit*, meant to record the resignation, not the death of Nicholas. Oliver refers to the year 1193, the letter of Olave II. to the dean and chapter of York about the consecration of Nicholas, to which the monks objected, whereas Nicholas in his letter (*Mon.* ii. 19,) says that he is the choice of the monks; may it not, therefore, have referred to the consecration of the Abbot Nicholas at a later date? The Icelandic annals record the consecration of Coll, or Kolas, or Klaus, which is the same as Nicholas, in the year 1210. No doubt, by the bull of Anastasius IV., the right of consecration belonged to Nidaros and not to York; yet the issue of a brief in February 1205, by Pope Innocent III., in which the rights of Nidaros are set forth, would lead to the belief that these rights had been questioned or violated.

Nicholas was an Argyllshire man, and was first an Augustinian canon of the Priory of Wartse, in the East Riding of Yorkshire, whence he went to the Cistercian Abbey of Meaux, situated about six miles north of Hull. In 1203 he presented King John, in the fourth year of his reign, with 40s., according to the Pipe Roll, as a deprecatory gift.—(Beck's *Furness.*) In the Egerton copy of the Chronicle of Meaux by Thomas Burton, published under the authority of the Master of the Rolls, is the following notice, vol. i. p. 380:—Ejus tempore (*i.e.* in the abbacy of Hugh) monachus quidem S. de nostra congregatione electus est in abbatem Fornasiensem, et postea in Episcopum Sodorensem in Mannia. (In his time a certain monk S., of our congregation, was elected Abbot of Furness, and afterwards Bishop of the Sodor diocese, in Man). This passage is wanting in Sir Thomas Phillipp's MS. The editor observes that the initial letter S., interlined in the MS., is clearly an error for N.; adding that the Abbot of Furness, who became Bishop of Man, was Nicholas of Meaux. Now as Nicholas became Abbot of Furness during the abbacy at Meaux of Hugh, his appointment must have been between the years 1210-1220, the period of Hugh's abbacy, so that he could not have been elected to Man either in 1193 or 1203. In 1218, March 6, Henry III. of England warned Olave of Man not to extend his hand to the Abbey of Furness: can this have any reference to the subject of the letter to the dean and chapter of York, in which Olave tells them not to heed the clamour or complaints of the monks of Furness? In 1224, May 15, Pope Honorius III. commissions the Archbishop of York—Walter de Gray—to examine the petition of Nicholas, seeking to be relieved from his bishopric, as the king and people were opposed to him, and to grant his request if he deemed it expedient.—(*Mon.* ii. 67. Stubbs applies this to Bishop John.) That his request was granted appears from the signature of Nicholas, as witness to a charter about Hexham, under Archbishop Walter de Gray in 1226, August 4,—Nicholas quondam Manniæ et Insularum Episcopus, (Nicholas, formerly Bishop of Man and the Isles), (Surtees Soc. ii. 92.); and also in the same year, August 20, to a document about the Priory of Stainfield, in Lincolnshire, under the same archbishop.—Dug. *Mon.* vol. i. 506, 1655, or new edition, vol. iv. 309, citing *Dean and Chapter Archives of York*, folio 104.]

[a] [Reginald was nephew to Kings Reginald and Olaf. Munch's reasoning

a monk of Russin, since he was buried there, and Russin being a daughter of Furness, the monks of this abbey probably now again exerted their pretended right, whence it follows, that Reginald was consecrated by the Archbishop of York ; this is also corroborated by his not being mentioned in the Icelandic annals, and consequently, as we must infer, not acknowledged by the Nidrosian See. His successor John, of whom nothing else is known, seems likewise, to infer from his burial place, to have been consecrated at York. It was not till the consecration of his successor Simon, that the metropolitan rights of the Nidrosian See commenced to be duly respected and obeyed for a longer period. As Simon was consecrated in 1226, the time of the successive episcopates of Reginald and John added together cannot have exceeded nine years.

NOTE 55, p. 116.—*Jacet apud Jerewos in Anglia.*

The name "Jerewos" seems to be a corruption of "Jernemuthe," Yarmouth.[a]

NOTE 56, p. 116.—*Post hunc Symon*[b] *Erchadiensis.*

We learn from the Icelandic annals that Simon was consecrated in the year 1226, and as his consecration is mentioned together with that of Arne, Bishop of Bergen, Orm of Oslo, and Askel of Stavanger, it is to be inferred that they were consecrated all four on one day by Archbishop Peter of Nidaros, who had just arrived from Rome with the

from the appointment and consecration and burial of Reginald, will not hold for the reasons given in footnotes (*a*) p. 172, (*b*) 238, (*a*) 240, etc. Professor Stubbs thinks he was consecrated in Norway. Is he not the bishop consecrated by the Archbishop of Dublin, alluded to by Pope Honorius III., whom King Reginald forbade the clergy to receive, and whom he otherwise persecuted? See Appendix, No. 11. Cumming says that Reginald died in 1225. Hardy's *Le Neve* about 1226.]

[a] [Jerewos is said to be Jervaux the Cistercian house in Yorkshire, primarily called Yorevalle. Jarrow has also been suggested; and by Keith, Jurby, in the Isle of Man. Keith, and Hardy's *Le Neve*, and Cumming, give as the date of John's accession 1226. Stubbs gives 1219, and refers to him the letter of Pope Honorius III., published in the Appendix, No. 11, and another letter dated May 15, 1224 (Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 67), exonerating him from his episcopate, and says that he witnessed a deed of bishop Walter de Gray, September 25, 1230. This he gives on the authority of *Le Neve.*]

[b] [Dr. Gordon (*Monasticon*, i. 580) says that Simon, Bishop of the Isles, appears also to have been Abbot of Iona in 1226. He was present at the settlement of a dispute with the Bishop of Moray about the church of Kincardine, in Strathspey.]

pallium, at the close of the preceding year.[a] The Saga of King Hácon relates that in the autumn of 1226, Bishop Simon, John, Earl of Orkney, and the Abbot of Iona, met King Hácon in Bergen, and treated of some important affairs with him; the archbishop having been there a little before the king's arrival; it is therefore very likely that the consecration of Simon had been celebrated while the archbishop made his stay in Bergen.[b] There can be no doubt that Simon, whose promotion happened shortly after the victory of Olaf, in 1224, was a protegè of this king, and that accounts very well for his being consecrated in Norway, although he was an Argyle-man; since it was the policy of Olaf and his followers always to look for support from Norway against the party of Reginald, and consequently to maintain the Norwegian interests and the rights of the Norwegian crown in Man and the Isles. The important affairs of which Simon and the Abbot of Iona had to treat, were perhaps the defection of the Manxmen from Reginald in 1226, and their homage to Olaf as sole monarch.

It is mentioned here, as well as above, p. 100, that Simon built the church of St. German, *i.e.*, the cathedral of Man and the Isles at Holm Peel. And immediately afterwards, p. 100, the first mention is made of a chapter with the right of election, and an archdeacon. As it is certain that no chapter existed before, it is evident that this important institution was founded by Simon, and closely connected with the erection of the new cathedral.[c] It was no doubt the intention of Simon to consolidate the diocese, and to prevent, for times to come, either the detaching of the Northern Isles, or the interference of the monks of Furness or of the Archbishop of York in the election and consecration of the future bishops.[d] In so far this arrangement was

[a] Hák. Hák. Saga, ch. 131. [b] *Ibidem*, ch. 147.

[c] As a farther proof of the ecclesiastical zeal of Simon, we add that there exists a record of Statutes, enacted in a diocesan ecclesiastical synod held by him, A.D. 1229; the Statutes are printed in *Concilia Magnæ Britaniæ*, ed. Wilkins, i. 664.

[d] [This is pure conjecture; Simon could not give to his Chapter rights which the Holy See had given to Furness, unless with the Pope's sanction, or by his concession. It does not appear on record that the Chapter exercised the right of election after Simon's time; on the contrary, Pope Innocent IV., in his bull of February 16, 1244, speaks of the right of election by the monks of Furness having been hitherto peacefully recognised, and at their request he sanctions the consecration of the Bishop by the Archbishop of York, with the permission, however, of the Archbishop of Drontheim. See Appendix, No. 19. In 1349 the right of election is said in a bull of Clement VI. to have been by ancient usage in the clergy of the cathedral city, and of the diocese, Appendix, No. 29, by whom, together with the people, Harold

quite in the interest of Norway, and may therefore have been suggested during his stay there at his consecration. Indeed, the metropolitan jurisdiction of the Nidrosian archbishop appears now to have been thoroughly established and acknowledged in Man, no doubt through the exertions of King Olaf and his party; the most remarkable evidence of that fact being this, that even the Abbot of Icolmkill, who might have claimed exemption at least from the supremacy of the bishop, repaired to Norway in 1226, thereby practically acknowledging his dependency, and afterwards, as we shall see next (we do not know whether it was the same or his successor), when appearing at the papal court, must have acknowledged himself to have come "ex partibus Norwegiæ."[a]

In the beginning of the year 1244, when Simon perhaps was already expected soon to die, the monks of Furness, as we learn from the papal letter of February 16, 1244, printed in the Appendix,[b] made one last attempt to obtain from the recently elected Pope, Innocent IV., a confirmation of their pretended right to elect the bishop from themselves, but evidently not with the expected or wished for success. In their remonstrances with the pope, of which the letter gives the contents, they used, as we see, a great deal of cunning and sophistry, blending true assertions with false ones, and especially taking care not to characterise the See with any other name than with that of *Man*, hoping, no doubt, thereby, and by carefully avoiding that of the Sudreys (*ecclesia Sodorensis*), to make the Pope believe that the See in question was another than the latter, and that he might confirm their claim without contradicting former regulations. The Pontiff, however, although maybe not aware of the identity of the *ecclesia Mannensis* with the *ecclesia Sodorensis*,[c] was too wary to grant the request uncon-

required the election to be made of Lawrence, though he had been elected by the Chapter, as is stated by the Chronicle, which, however, makes no mention of the *right* of election which Munch attributes to it. The accidental mention of a Chapter on this occasion, does not prove that there was no Chapter at an earlier period. In March 1253, Pope Innocent writes distinct copies of a letter to the Chapter, to the clergy, and to the people, on the appointment of Bishop Richard, but in 1349, Pope Clement VI., on a similar occasion, sends letters to the clergy and to the people only. In the synod held by Bishop Simon in 1229 (Cumming says 1239) thirteen canons were enacted, most of which relate to probate of wills, dues of the clergy, and other inferior matters; they are published in Oliver's *Mon.* iii. 176.]

[a] [See Appendix, No. 21.] [b] [See Appendix, No. 19.]

[c] [This is very improbable. The See was called indifferently Mannensis or Sodorensis. The connection of the See of Man with the Archbishop of Nidaros dates only from the bull of Anastasius IV., in 1154; and this bull, as Munch states in his note [b], p. 246, was renewed or reissued by Pope Innocent IV. in

ditionally; it is even not unlikely that he had been warned by the intriguing abbot Björn of Holm, in Norway, who happened to be in Rome at that time. We learn that he granted their request, which purposed to secure not only to themselves the right of electing, but also to the Archbishop of York the right of consecrating, the bishop, on condition, however, that matters were really as they alleged, and that the Norwegian archbishop had no objection, about which a letter was simultaneously directed to that prelate. The result is not expressly told, but as there cannot be the least doubt that the Archbishop of Nidaros objected to it,[a] and protested with all his might, the whole matter had necessarily to be dropt, nor is there any sign of its having ever been revived.[b]

It is said, p. 100, that Bishop Simon died in 1247, which agrees very well with the statement, p. 116, that the See was vacant after his death for about six years; it being quite certain from the Saga, as well as the papal letter, printed in the Appendix, No. 23, that his successor was inaugurated in 1253. It is, however, added immediately afterwards, p. 100, that Simon died in the eighteenth year of his episcopate, which does not agree with his being consecrated in 1226, twenty-one years before 1247. If then the number is not a mere blunder, we cannot explain this apparent inaccuracy otherwise than by supposing that Simon had been prevented by the troubles between King Olaf and his brother Reginald, from taking his See of Man in possession till after the death of King Reginald in 1229. As a further confirmation of his decease having happened in 1247, we may perhaps regard the fact, recorded in the papal letter to the Abbot of Iona, dated April 22, 1247, and printed for the first time in our Appendix as No. 21, viz., that this abbot repaired personally to the Pope at Lyons, to present his compliments, and obtain the grant of using episcopal *insignia* under

1253, so that the Holy See must have been well informed of the condition and position of the See of Man, and nobody would know this better than the monks of Furness.]

[a] [There appears no reason why the Archbishop should object to the proposition stated in Document No. 19,—namely, that, in virtue of faculty from the Pope, and leave from the Archbishop of Drontheim, the Archbishop of York should consecrate a bishop already regularly appointed to a See subject to the Norwegian metropolitan, when circumstances rendered it very inconvenient or dangerous for the bishop-elect to go to Norway for the purpose of receiving consecration.]

[b] Shortly before, the successor of Simon, Richard, was consecrated by Archbishop Serlo, A.D. 1253, the foundation bull of the metropolitan See of Nidaros was renewed *in extenso*, and confirmed by Innocent IV. (*Dipl. Norv.* iii. 3), and here the Sudreyan Isles are expressly named. [See Appendix, No. 5, for the differences between the two bulls.]

some limitations; as it is most likely that for requesting such a privilege he chose expressly the time when the episcopal See was vacant, and when there were none to make objections. We learn, also, that the request was granted.[a] In the Icelandic annals the decease of Simon is wrongly referred to A.D. 1249.

When the Abbot of Iona, as we learn from the letter just mentioned, visited the Pope at Lyons, and obtained the right to wear the episcopal mitre and ring, there can be no doubt that it was also he who got the letter of protection to Dugald, Lord of Machumel in Kentire, dated only four days before, which is given in the Appendix, No. 20, not because there is anything remarkable in the general contents, but chiefly because Kentire is said here to belong to the diocese of Lismore, more generally called the diocese of Argyle; the former denomination appearing to contain some reminiscences from the times when the Isles had not their bishop in common with Man.

[a] [Such concessions are not unusual, and the Pope in granting the privilege would be more influenced by the personal presence of the abbot than by the vacancy of the See. Besides, as the See was vacant for six years, no argument can be drawn therefrom as to the time of Simon's death; for if he died in 1244, or 1247, or 1249, it would have been equally vacant. Usher says that Simon was made bishop in 1230, and died in 1249. Keith says that he witnessed a charter in 1234, the 17th of the reign of King Alexander II. of Scotland. Hardy's *Le Neve* gives 1249 as the year of his death. In 1236 Pope Gregory IX. requested the bishop of Moray to provide by canonical election a bishop for Lismore (Argyll) as the Bishop of Sodor, its administrator, sought to be relieved from the additional burden, on account of his infirmities.—Theiner, p. 33. See Appendix, No. 18. The real date of his death must be 1244 or 1247.

In some recent excavations at Peel Castle there have been found human remains mixed with the bones of a dog, in the site usually assigned to a founder, which have consequently been conjectured to be those of bishop Simon. The dog is often taken as a symbol of the preacher, because the faithful dog and the good preacher by their bark terrify wolves and thieves, or as an old French MS. has it: "Li bon cien, li bon precheur qui abaient et espoentent les lous et les larrons." A few years ago there was found the skull of a greyhound in the tomb of the great Earl of Westmoreland, in Staindrop church. Bones of animals are sometimes found amongst human remains in cairns in Scotland of pagan times, but these offer no explanation for the bones of a dog in the grave of a christian bishop in the 13th century. The body of the bishop had been embalmed in a rough sort of way, or at least quick lime and sand, or impure lime, had been put into the chest or grave with the body, which it quite filled, leaving the marks of the ribs on the slaked lime. It is not certain that it was the grave of Simon, or of any bishop: indeed the absence of any trace of the insignia of a bishop usually buried with him leaves it very doubtful.]

NOTE 57, p. 116.—*Post Symonem vero, etc.*

Here the whole transaction is omitted, which has been mentioned above in the chronicle of the kings, p. 100, and which accounts for the long vacancy after the decease of Simon. It appears that the recently founded Chapter had exercised for the first time its right of election, choosing their archdeacon, Lawrence, for his successor, but that the whole clergy and the people, unwilling to forego their ancient privilege of electing the bishops in common, had protested against transferring it to the body of canons, in a letter sent to King Harold, who happened to be in Norway, and that Harold, siding with the protesters, denied his assent to Lawrence until the election had been repeated in the ancient manner.[a] There seems, however, not to have been any doubt that the election of Lawrence would be confirmed, but this was never to happen, as Lawrence shared the melancholy fate of the king and his queen, who were drowned in Sumburgh Roost on their return to the Isles, A.D. 1248.

It is not explained why the See still continued vacant for about five years, yet we may guess, with pretension almost to certainty, that the right of election continued some time to be a matter of dispute between the Chapter and the other party, especially as we learn from the letter of Innocent IV., given in the Appendix as No. 23, that Richard, the final successor of Simon, was named by provision, a rather unfailing sign in those times of the election having been disputed and protracted beyond the proper time. It is also related in the Saga of King Hácon,

[a] [Munch strains the text of the Chronicle: it simply says that Harold refused to give assent to his consecration, on account of some letters which had been sent from Man against him, until, in his presence, on his return to Man, he should be elected by all the clergy and people. Both Cumming and Hardy's *Le Neve* erroneously state that he was consecrated by the Archbishop of Dronthiem. About a century after the shipwreck of Lawrence, Bishop Gyrd Ivarsson of Iceland was drowned in the same tempestuous sea on his way to Norway, so that there is no reason to be surprised, apart from any other consideration, at the preference felt by those having ecclesiastical business at the archiepiscopal court, for York over Nidaros.

About the time of the death of Simon, or during the vacancy of the See, King Harold of Man issued a charter of protection to the monks of Furness, and also made unto them a grant of all kinds of mines, both beneath and above the soil of Man, and three acres of land near St. Trinian's, for the erection of a house for their workmen, and store-room for their minerals, free of all secular service, and exempted them from toll and all other custom.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 77-81.]

ch. 276, that the Nidrosian archbishop Sörli or Serlo, who had been elected A.D. 1252, and had repaired to Rome as usual, in order to be confirmed by the pope, consecrated afterwards, during his stay there, two of his suffragans, Peter, Bishop of Hamar, and Richard of Sudrey. From our Chronicle we learn that Richard was an Englishman, from the papal letter (Appendix, No. 23), that he was chaplain to the Cardinal John of St. Lorenzo in Lucina, and canon of St. Andrews in Scotland, likewise, that he was not immediately nominated by the pope himself, but at his order by the archbishop. The circumstance that the letter to the Chapter of Sudrey is only accompanied by one to the clergy in general, and one to the people, but none to the king, although it was usual to address the king particularly on such occasions, may be accounted for by what is known from our Chronicle, that Magnus was not duly installed as king till in the course of 1253, while the papal letter is dated the 14th of March in the same year. As Richard was consecrated in 1253, and died in 1274, on his return from the general council of Lyons, he did not fill the See, as our Chronicle says, for twenty-three years, but only twenty-one. The name of his dying place, Langalyver in Copland, we have not been able to find on the maps. Yet it must have been somewhere near Furness abbey, since he was buried there.[a]

NOTE 58, p. 116.—*Post hunc Marcus, etc.*

We learn from the Icelandic annals that Marcus was consecrated by the Archbishop of Nidaros in the city of Tunsberg, in the south of Norway, A.D. 1275. Afterwards we learn from the Saga of the Ice-

[a] [Munch's reasoning will hardly hold: for Magnus was de facto king in 1252, and the Chronicle makes the dedication of the church of Rushen abbey take place in the fifth year of Richard's episcopate, and the fifth year of the reign of Magnus. If the years of Richard's consecration and death be included, the twenty-three years of his episcopate are made up. However, as the general council did not terminate till July 17, 1274, he may not have reached home till 1275. Langalyver is a manor in Cumberland. At the dissolution Furness held land in Copland of the annual value of £4 : 6 : 8. St. Bee's abbey was in Copland, and its prior was a baron of the Isle of Man, the convent holding lands there.—Oliver's *Mon.* i. 201, n; 228-9; ii. 92. Stubbs says that Richard died in 1275, and was buried on March 25. The *Reg. of Paisley*, under date 1253, record that Stephen, Bishop of the Isles, confirmed to the monastery of Paisley all the churches and lands they held in his diocese. Who was he? Hardy's *Le Neve* thinks that there were two Richards, Stephen coming between the two, but this seems an improbable conjecture. Richard, Bishop of Man and the Isles, in the first year of his episcopate granted an indulgence of forty days to persons benefiting in any way the church of St. Cuthbert at Durham. In 1257 King Magnus confirmed

landic bishop Arni, that Marcus was in Norway A.D. 1280, and no doubt present at least at the first sittings of the provincial council, then held in Bergen by Archbishop John. But no clue is given to explain the fact, mentioned by our Chronicle, that he was expelled by the Manxmen for some time and that the Island in consequence was subjected to interdict for three years. We may venture to suggest that the dispute between the Chapter and the people and clergy of Man not yet being ended, but only suspended by the nomination by provision of Richard, Marcus had been elected by the Chapter, and of course confirmed in his dignity and consecrated by the Norwegian archbishop, but on his return in 1275 had been rejected by the other party, and that he did not return and had not been acknowledged by his flock till 1280, having, perhaps, meanwhile personally visited the papal See in 1277, to make his complaints and obtain the decree of interdict, and spent the rest of his exile in Norway.[a] The frequent change of hand-

the liberties of the church of Man in a charter addressed to Bishop Richard. He grants him leave to hold his court, with powers of life and death; the mines of lead and iron; freedom of the clergy from secular fines; the island of St. Patrick, Kirk Christ Lezayre; half of the fishery in Mirescoge.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 89, 92, 162; iii. 13. The V. R. Can. Raine of York has an impression of his seal.]

[a] [Stubbs, citing a continuation of William of Newburgh by a monk of Furness, shows that the conjecture of Munch about the election of Mark is erroneous. On the death of Richard, the Abbot of Furness went to the King of Scotland to prosecute his right about the election of bishops. The king received the abbot graciously, and deceived him with specious promises; but treacherously forbade the clergy and people, at their peril, to receive the elect of the abbot and convent of Furness. Meanwhile the clergy and people of Man, meeting for the election of a bishop, unanimously elected Master Gilbert, Abbot of Rushen, whom the King of Scotland, in opposition to the canons, set aside, and in his place intruded one Master Mark, a relative of the bailiff of Man, whom he straight away sent, with letters from himself, and with such as he had been able to extort from the clergy and people under their seals, to Norway, to his metropolitan, the Archbishop of Nidaros, for consecration. The writer did not know the result; but it ended in the consecration of Mark. By the treaty of Perth, July 2, 1266, the ancient kingdom of the Isles had been made over by Magnus of Norway to Alexander III. who still ruled Scotland; and he was no doubt anxious to have for a partisan a Bishop of Man, as King Edward of England was then beginning to manifest an encroaching spirit in his policy towards Scotland.

The diligence of Dr. Oliver has made us acquainted with several documents elucidating the history of Mark. In 1289 "Marc, evesque de Man," occurs amongst the prelates, counts, barons, etc., the guardians of the kingdom of Scotland, signing a letter to Edward I. of England.—*Mon.* ii. 106. In 1290 the Isle of Man was in Edward's hands; and it is curious that, in the taxation of the Province of York for the levying of contributions, under the sanction of Pope Nicholas IV., towards a crusade, the Abbey of Man is named in the deanery of Coupland, under the

writing in these entries testifies to their having been added successively by contemporaneous writers. If Marcus, as it is said, was bishop for twenty-four years, he must have died in 1299.[a]

NOTE 59, p. 118.—*Post hunc Alanus, etc.*

Of the four bishops here enumerated, Alan, Gilbert, Bernard, and Thomas, we have not found anything elsewhere, and therefore know nothing about their election and consecration, except what is said in general, p. 118, that they were all consecrated by the Archbishop of Nidaros. That some vacancies must have occurred between their respective episcopates, and therefore, perhaps, the above mentioned dispute may have continued, appears from the circumstance that the two and a half years of Gilbert, the four of Bernard, and the eighteen of Thomas, in all twenty-four and a half, do not fill up the gap of twenty-eight and a half years between the death of Alan on the 15th of Feruary, 1320, and that of Thomas, on the 20th of September, 1348.[b]

archdeaconry of Richmond, as assessed at 6s. 8d. (The taxation of the Ecclesiastical Province of York was not completed till 1292, Lingard ii. 589).—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 110; Gregson's *Fragments.* In March 1291, Mark held a Diocesan Synod at Kirk Braddan, in which 34 canons were enacted for the improvement of ecclesiastical discipline, and the regulation of tithes and dues. Keith says there were 39 canons, Cumming, 35; they are published by Dr. Oliver, *Mon.* iii. 182-201. In 1292 Mark appears at the great parliament of Berwick, as one of the auditors, declaring that the competitors for the crown, Bruce and Baliol, had concluded their pleadings, so that the king might proceed to judgment.—*Mon.* ii. 118. In 1296 the bailiff of Dumfries is ordered to bring the venerable prelate Mark, Bishop of Sodor, to make his allegiance to Edward I.—*Mon.* ii. 132. In 1299, Mark of his own free will, appropriates to the abbot and monks of Furness, the churches of St. Michael and St. Maughold. The abbot, supposed to be Dalton, afterwards deposed, was then holding the singular office of Custodian of Man.—*Mon.* i. 202; ii. 133. Stubbs thinks that Mark died not earlier than 1303, possibly as late as 1305, when we first hear of his successor. Keith says that he was sent prisoner to London; but he gives neither date nor authority. He says also that he had been Chancellor of Scotland.]

[a] There exists also a record of council statutes, enacted by Marcus. See *Monasticon Anglicanum* and Langebek *Scr. R. D.* iii. Marcus likewise was present at the great parliament held in Berwick in the summer of 1292, to settle the claims of the different pretenders to the crown of Scotland; Marcus was one of the judges named by John Baliol.—Rymer, i. 2. p. 755.

[b] [Some writers have created confusion in the succession of bishops by introducing new names. Keith, and Cumming, and Hardy's *Le Neve*, introduced before Alan *Onachus* or Onanus; Cumming places him in 1298, on the authority of William Quayle's MS. from Spottiswood's *Scottish Church*, Book ii. 116. Keith places him about the year 1304; but it is generally held that he is one and the

NOTE 60, p. 118.—*Wilhelmus Russell.*

The letters [a] of Pope Clement VI., by which the election of William was confirmed, are still preserved in the papal Registers, and we have given at length in the Appendix, No. 30, that addressed to the Arch-

same with Alan. After this supposed Onachus, and before Alan, Cumming (Isle of Man, 346) introduces a Mauricius in 1303, who was sent prisoner to London by King Edward I., and therefore supposed never to have been consecrated, and consequently never put into the catalogue of bishops; but Keith says that Mauricius or Marus was the same person as Mark, so that we may rightly follow the Chronicle in placing Alan after Mark, and regard Mauricius and Onanus as myths. There is a Patent Roll of 33 Edward I. in Prynne, iii. 1111, answering to the year 1305, March 25, in which the king gives him safe conduct to visit the churches in the Isles of Inchegal.—Stubbs. In the ancient rolls of Scotland occurs this note of a presentation to the living of Kirk Cairbre or Arbory, in 1295: "Allan of Wightown holds letters of presentation to the Church of St. Carber in Man."—Cumming, citing Train's *Hist.* i. 339. Bishop Alan was one of the Scotch clergy who recognised the claim of Robert Bruce to the crown in 1309. Oliver publishes two documents that require explanation, ii. 162, 68; to a charter granted by Robert Bruce to the Earl of Moray, December 20, 1313, the witnesses are William, John, William, David, and David, Bishops of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Dunkeld, Moray, and Sodor. Which was Bishop of Sodor? October 24, 1317, John, Bishop of Sodor, has letters of protection from the Marquis to accompany the King, Edward II., and the Marquis to the Isle of Man. Alan died February 15, 1321.

Gilbert McLellan, called by Johnstone, M'Cleland, succeeded Alan in 1321. The Chronicle says that he ruled two years and a half, and hence he is supposed to have died in 1323; but Keith (Scottish bishops, 302) says that he is found witness to several charters in the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first years of King Robert I.'s reign, which coincide with the years 1325, 6, 7. In order to reconcile the discrepancy, Stubbs conjectures that the two years of the Chronicle are a mistake for 6—(ii. for vi).

Gilbert was succeeded by Bernard de Linton, Abbot of Arbroath, and not by Bernard, Abbot of Kilwinning, as some English writers have erroneously supposed. Bernard was bishop elect in 1328, and was consecrated in 1329 (Keith, 302). In 1296 he was rector of the church of Mordington, in Berwickshire, and swore fealty to Edward I. on the 24th of August of that year. In 1307 Robert Bruce, on ascending the throne of Scotland, made him his chancellor, on the removal of Nicholas de Balmute, Bishop of Dunblane. In 1309 he was made Abbot of Arbroath, and on August 21, 1312, entered into an engagement with the Abbot of Kilwinning for the redemption of his predecessor, John, then a simple monk, from captivity in England. He celebrated the battle of Bannockburn in a Latin poem, a fragment of which is still extant. He continued abbot and chancellor till 1328. Under him the abbey of Arbroath attained its greatest prosperity. He executed many repairs on its buildings at considerable expense. Robert Bruce frequently

[a] [See Appendix, Nos. 29, 30, and 31.]

bishop of Nidaros, from which we learn that the cause why the confirmation and consecration were not given by the latter, is by no means to be ascribed to any intention of the Pope to detach the Sudreyan See from the *Provincia Nidrosiensis*, or cause any prejudice to his metropolitan rights, but only to the circumstance that this episcopate, as all others, or in general all ecclesiastical benefices, had been reserved by the Pope for his own, to be provided for by himself; wherefore, at this period, we find in Registers an immense number of similar provisions, which were indeed as many encroachments[a] upon the rights of the legal

resided there, and during his patriotic efforts to free his country from English domination, it often witnessed the gathering of councils and parliaments within its walls. Bernard was most likely the Abbot of Arbroath whom Robert Bruce sent to Norway on state affairs, probably in connection with the negotiations that ended in the treaty of Inverness in 1312. In 1328 he was elected Bishop of Man and the Isles, and on the 30th of April in that year, William, Bishop of St. Andrews, made a visitation of his monastery, and in consideration of his upright life, his prudent government, his great merits, and in compensation for his expenses in repairing the monastery, granted to him all the funds of the church of Abernethy, with the chapel of Dron, for seven years. See Appendix, No. 28. In 1329 Bernard, Bishop of Sodor, witnessed a charter granted by King Robert Bruce to the city of Glasgow. He died in 1333; and was buried, some say at Kilwinning, others at Arbroath.—Dr. Gordon's *Monasticon*, i. 518-520; Keith, 302.

Thomas is said to have been made bishop in 1334, and to have died in 1348, after an episcopate of eighteen years; Cumming says fourteen, in order to reconcile the statement. In his time the English possessed themselves of the island, so that he was the last bishop appointed by the Scotch. November 24, 1341, King Edward III. directed Thomas de Drayton of Great Yarmouth to send the Bishop of Man, with the other persons seized at Carlisle, up to London; but to await further orders with regard to their ship and its freight.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 185. On the 17th of December following the King ordered the Bishop of Man to be set at liberty, and his goods and chattels to be restored to him, as he was in allegiance to the king, and was on his way to Rome about the business of his See, when he had been driven by stress of weather off Kirkall, into Lowestoff. The king further granted him letters of protection for the continuance of his journey, and for his return.—*Mon.* ii. p. 187, 190.]

[a] [These provisions could not be regarded as *encroachments upon rights* by Roman Catholics, because they consider the Pope, as supreme head of the church, to have the exclusive right and power of appointing bishops. Though he has had many ways, varying with times and circumstances, of selecting the person to be appointed, such as capitular elections, etc., these institutions of his own could not put limits, other than those dictated by expediency, to the exercise of his absolute rights and power. Hence, though we find in history complaints of appointments made by the Pope without having had recourse to the usual means of selection, we do not find the validity of such appointments called in question. The case is different in the supposition of a concordat, by which the Pope engages, in consideration of some advantage to be reaped by the church from the agreement,

electors and disponents, and, when regarding episcopates, generally accompanied by "*permissiones redeundi*," showing that the consecration has been given at the papal See, not by the proper metropolitan. In this manner, also, the present letters are followed by a *permissio redeundi* (No. 31), dated May 6, 1349, from which it appears that William was consecrated by the cardinal-bishop of Ostia, not, as it is stated in our Chronicle, by the Pope himself. By comparing the date of both letters we learn that the consecration must have taken place between the 27th of April and the 6th of May.

The letter of confirmation apprises us of the important fact that the dispute between the chapter and the people and clergy must at last have been ended in favour of the latter party; if, indeed, the chapter had not been entirely dissolved, which we might be induced to believe from the fact that none of the copies are addressed, as usually, to the chapter, this being not at all mentioned. If such a dissolution had happened, it must have been after 1320, in which year an archidiaconus Sodorensis, by the name of Cormac, is mentioned in a letter issued by Archbishop Eilif at Nidaros (Bartholiniana E. p. 134).[a] It would even seem from the fact that William had been formerly Abbot of Russin, that the pretensions of Furness had somehow again been revived. The three last copies show that at that time [b] William of Montague was the chief Lord of Man, and that he, Robert the Steward, Lord of Bute, and his son-in-law John Mac Donald of Isla, great-great grandson of Reginald Mac Somerled [c] were the three most powerful lords in the diocese. As No. 32 and 33 we give two other letters, which show that William did not return from Avignon till after the 14th of June 1349, and that he must have had some influence with the Pope in obtaining not unimportant grants, especially that of

to appoint a subject selected by a sovereign, provided there be no objection to his fitness for the office. These concordats however, did not exist at the time of which we are speaking.]

[a] [In the Appendix, No. 43, will be found a letter from Urban V. to an Archdeacon of Man, dated as late as 1368.]

[b] [January 13, 1364, the Scots agreed, in a treaty with England, to settle upon the youngest son of the King of England, Edward III., the lands in Galloway which were the inheritance of Edward Baliol, and the *Isle of Man*. The annual income of this island is rated at a thousand marks; and it is stipulated that if the Earl of Salisbury should claim the property of the island, an annuity of 1000 marks sterling should be paid to the prince, until lands of the same value are settled upon him, provided always that he is willing to hold the same as the sworn vassal of the King of Scotland.—Tytler, *Hist. Scot.*]

[c] See Genealogical Tables.

encumbering his church and see with a mortgage.[a] From the letter of Pope Urban V., dated December 7, 1367, which is given in the Appendix as No. 41, we learn that then there was a question, at the request of the Franciscan Provincial of Ireland and the said William of Montague, now Earl of Salisbury, about erecting a Franciscan convent in the Isle of Man, which, however, does not seem to have been put into execution.[b]

NOTE 61, p. 118.—*Obiit autem, etc.*

The date and year are so precisely stated, along with the time of his episcopate and the consecration of his successor, that there would seem to be no occasion for doubt as to the accuracy thereof. Still it is strange, that in the papal letter of provision, dated on the 26th of May 1377, which is given in the Appendix, No. 47, William is spoken of without the usual addition for the deceased, of "*bonæ memoriæ.*" This omission, however, cannot be but a mere accidental blunder.

NOTE 62, p. 120.—*Pridie mensis Junii, etc.*

The day is rightly described, the 31st of May A.D. 1374 being the Thursday after Trinity Sunday. This John Duncan was previously Archdeacon of Down, and nuncio, and collector of the papal revenues in these parts, as appears from the letters given in the Appendix, Nos. 39, 42, 44, and 45. What our Chronicle says about his election and confirmation is not quite according to the truth, in so far as the Pope did not properly confirm his election, but appointed him *proprio motu*, by way of pro-

[a] [See in Oliver's *Mon.* iii. page 202, the decrees of a synod held by this Bishop William, on 23d February 1850. William de Zouche, Archbishop of York, granted to William, Bishop of Man, a commission to confer orders in the diocese of York, December 11, 1351. This commission was renewed by his successor John de Thoresby, October 21, 1353.—Raine, i. 458. See records of some events of that time in the Appendix, Nos. 34, 5, 6, 7, 8, 40–46–48.]

[b] [Professor Munch is mistaken. A Franciscan Friary was erected at Bymaken, Beemaken, Bowmaken, or Bechmaken, in Kirk Arbory or Kirk Cairbre in 1373. The only remaining portions of the Friary remaining, now converted into a barn, are, Cumming thinks, of 15th century work. They lie about a quarter of a mile east from the parish church of Arbory, on the side of the road leading thence to Rushen. The lands of the Friary did not constitute a separate manor, but were held of the Lord of Man, at an annual rent of 20s. The prior was not a Baron of the Isle. In 1606, James I. leased Brymaken, Rushen, and the nunnery, to Sir Thomas Leigh Knightly, for forty years, at a fine of £101 : 15 : 11. In 1609 the king granted to William, Earl of Derby, the same properties for ever. In 1626 Charles I. granted them to his Queen, Henrietta Maria, for life, valuing them at £101 : 15 : 11. The Friary and lands are now held by the family of Greetham, descendants of the old loyal cavalier family of Tyldesley of Lancashire.]

vision, without regarding his election otherwise than as a mere recommendation. All this appears from the papal letter of provision, which we give here at length, with all the usual accompanying letters of recommendation (these, of course, only in extract), vide Appendix, No. 47. The date of the provision, however, or, as it is styled in our Chronicle, the confirmation, is rightly said here to be St. Leonard's[a] day, or the 6th of November. From the accompanying letter to the archbishop of Nidaros in Norway (Throud) we learn, what is exceedingly interesting, that even so far down as 1374, his metropolitan supremacy over the Bishop of the Sudreys was acknowledged by the *Curia;* the Sudreyan church being expressly characterised as "*suffraganea tua.*" How long it continued as such, we are not able to say, from want of documents; yet there is every reason to believe that in the papal chancery nothing was altered in this respect, at least down to the time when the See of St. Andrews was elevated into a metropolitan one by Pope Sixtus IV. in 1472; for in several lists of archiepiscopal Sees, with their respective suffragans, made in the 15th century, and preserved in the Vatican archives, the *Episcopus Sodorensis* is always referred to as suffragan to the *Archiepiscopus Nidrosiensis.*[b] Among the accompanying letters, one is directed to King Robert Stewart of Scotland, the same to whom, as Lord of Bute, a similar letter was addressed when William, the predecessor of John Duncan, was appointed bishop in 1349. Another letter, containing *verbotenus* the same, is addressed to "King William of Man"[c] (*Wilhelmo regi Minaviæ*), the particulars of which, however, we must leave to our English readers to supply. The cardinal, who consecrated Bishop John was Simon de Langham or Longam, who had previously been Prior and Abbot of Westminster, then successively Bishop of

[a] [There were two saints of the name of Leonard, one the Abbot of Noblac, commemorated November 6, the other abbot of Yandeuvre or Vandoeuvre, commemorated on the 15th of October. Dr. Oliver supposes the latter to be meant, Munch the former.]

[b] [Cumming says that on the death of John Donkan the See of Man and the Isles was divided into two, Man continuing to be the seat of the Bishop of Man, and Iona becoming that of the Bishop of the Western Isles; but John Donkan did not die Bishop of Man, being translated to Down in 1395. In the year 1458, Pope Calixtus III. (Oliver's *Mon.* iii. p. 20), speaks of Man as a suffragan of York.—Oliver's *Mon.* iii. 21. Raine (*Archbishops of York*, i. 31) considers that this bull formally subjects Man to York. To me it seems to imply that it had been previously subjected. The Bollandists (October 20) say that in 1478 Glasgow was made an ecclesiastical province, and that the Bishop of the Sodor diocese (probably the Isles only are meant) was made suffragan. They contend, however, that the two Sees were not divided till about 1540.]

[c] [This was William de Montague, Earl of Salisbury, and Lord of Man.]

London, of Ely, Chancellor, Archbishop of Canterbury (in the text of our Chronicle "*Cantuariensem*" is distorted into "*Carocuviacum*"), Cardinal-priest of St. Praxede or St. Sixtus, Legate in England and France; in 1373 he was promoted to the cardinal-bishoprick of Præneste, and died in Avignon on the 22d of July, 1376 (Ciaccone, ii. 568). Why bishop John, as it is stated in the last words of our Chronicle, was arrested in Boulogne and kept as prisoner for more than a year, as it appears, we are not able to tell; maybe there was something the matter about his collecting-business, which he no doubt did not execute to the pleasure of all parties. Even the successor of Gregory XI., Urban VI., was not satisfied with his behaviour, as appears from the letter given in the Appendix, No. 50.[a] Curious it is, that shortly after his deliverance, in a letter of provision issued by Pope Gregory to a Sudreyan clergyman, Malcolm, son of Isaiah, dated May 26, 1377, the predecessor of John, bishop William, is mentioned without the usual addition for deceased persons, of "*bonæ memoriæ*," as if he were still living (Appendix, No. 49). This however, must be regarded only as an error of omission, as bishop John must have been too well acquainted with the Pope, that the latter should have forgotten the particulars about his accession.

NOTE 63, p. 120.—*On the duration of the subjection of the See to the Archbishop of Drontheim.*

We wind up these Notes, subjoining some, hitherto unknown, supplements to the knowledge of the Metropolitan Supremacy of Nidaros over

[a] [This investigation must have been satisfactory, though we do not know the result of it; for fifteen years later, A.D. 1395, he was translated by Pope Boniface IX. to the See of Down. Both as Bishop of Sodor, and Bishop of Down, he seems to have been well thought of both by Richard II. and Henry IV. July 13, 1388 (see Appendix, No. 51), the 12th of Richard II., a commission was given to him by the council, to treat with the sons of John de Islay, late Lord of the Isles, regarding a treaty of alliance and commerce between them and England. October 15, 1393, 16 Richard II., he received from the royal treasury £66 : 13 : 4 in discharge of 100 marks for charges and labour incurred by him in prosecuting certain affairs for the king in the Isles.—Oliver's *Mon.* ii. 211, where it is erroneously supposed to refer to Bishop Waldby. September 16, 1405 (see Appendix, No. 52), the 6th of Henry IV., being now Bishop of Down, he was again deputed to negotiate a lasting peace and alliance between England and Ireland on the one side, and Donald, the Lord of the Isles, and his brother John on the other. Before his translation to Down, whilst yet Bishop of the Sudreys, he received, January 14, 1390, a suffragan's commission from the Bishop of Salisbury, similar to that

Man and the Sudreys. In a manuscript codex[a] written in the 15th century, "*liber censuum Romanæ ecclesiæ*," composed by Cencius Camerarius, A.D. 1192, but with additions of later dates, showing that it has been kept *à jour* with all subsequent alterations, we read, folio 44, under the superscription "Norwegia:"

"In archiepiscopatu Nidrosiensi—In episcopatu Bergensi—In episcopatu Stauuengrensi—In episcopatu Hamarensi—In episcopatu Asloensi—In episcopatu Horchadensi—In episcopatu *Sudereiensi*, alias *Manensi* (to which is added; *Ecclesia Sancti Columbi de Insula Hy .ii. Bisancios*[b] *annuatim*)—In episcopatu Scalotensi in Islandia—In episcopatu Holensi in Islandia—In episcopatu Pharensi in Grotlandia[c]—In episcopatu Gardensi in Grotlandia."

In another manuscript codex,[d] written about A.D. 1400, or perhaps later,[e] containing first an alphabetical list of all existing bishoprics, with the taxation of their revenues, referred to their respective Metropolitan provinces; then a similar list of all monasteries; and finally a "*Provinciale omnium mundi Ecclesiarum Patriarchalium, Metropolitanarum et Episcopalium*," *i.e.*, a list of the Sees, systematically enumerated under their respective metropolitans, without addition of the taxes, the Sudreyan See is mentioned, in the first list, under the letter S, in these words:

Sodorensis in Noruegia et prouincia Nidrosiensi, floren. vj.[c] *lx.* (660); in the third, folio 53 recto, the list of Norwegian bishoprics begins with the words *Archiepiscopus Nidrosiensis hos habet suffraganeos;* then follow first those in Norway proper, and Greenland, next to them "Olorchadensem uel Orkadensem, Scorensem (*i.e*, Sodorensem) uel Insulanum, prope Scociam est;" then those of Iceland,—while no mention is made

which his predecessor William had held from the Archbishop of York. In Hardy's *Le Neve* it is incorrectly stated that Bishop Dongan died in 1380; he died in 1412. The Irish *Eccles. Record* (1865, p. 267) calls him Dougan.]

[a] MS. Cod. in the Vatican Archives.

[b] [See Appendix, No. 6. The besant was a coin of pure gold, struck at Byzantium (Constantinople), in the time of the Christian emperors. Its value is generally estimated at 9s. 4½d. sterling. It was current in England from the tenth century till Edward III.—*N. and Q.* 4 s. vii. 208.]

[c] This means, of course, Greenland, but is, as everybody sees, a mistake.

[d] MS. Cod. likewise in the Vatican Archives.

[e] As the See of St. Andrews, in Scotland, is always spoken of here as an archbishopric, it might be fair to conclude that the book was written after the erection of this See to an archiepiscopate by Pope Sixtus IV. in 1472, but the handwriting has evidently an older character, and that denomination might possibly be a blunder, of which there are more than one in the book, especially as to the spelling of the names.

of Man or the Sudreys under the "archiepiscopus Eboracensis" or "archiepiscopus Sancti Andree."[a]

[a] [From the time that King Magnus offered, in vow, to St. Olave, king and martyr, himself and his kingdom, the archbishop of Nidaros claimed a right for himself and his suffragans to give a vote, and the first in order, in the election of a new king, but in 1273 the privilege was restricted to the occasion of introducing a new dynasty.—Thomassinus, Pt. iii. lib. 1, c. 31.]

INDEX

TO THE NOTES OF PROFESSOR MUNCH.

NOTE		PAGE
1.	On the Chronology adopted by the Chronicle	123
2.	On the Norwegian relations with Man prior to 1070	123
3.	On Harold Hardrade	142
4.	On the lineage of Godred Crowan; his title to the throne of Man; and chronology of his death	143
5.	On the chronology of the immediate successors to Godred Crowan	148
6.	Who was Donald son of Tade?	152
7.	Who was Ingemund?	152
8.	On the battle of Sandwath	153
9.	On the western expeditions of King Magnus of Norway	153
10.	On his occupation of Man	155
11.	On his expeditions to Anglesea and Ireland; his arrangements with Scotland; and his death	156
12.	Chronology of the reign of Olave, and his relations with Norway	166
13.	On the marriage of Olave	167
14.	On the genealogy of the Somerleds and their relations with the Kings of Man	167
15.	On the relations between Savigny and Furness and Rushen, and their connection with the See of Man	169
16.	On Furness	170
17.	Chronology of the foundation of Rivaulx	170
18.	On the relation of Rushen to the See of Man	170
19.	Chronology of the foundation of Melrose	171
20.	On the date of the death of St. Malachy	171
21.	On the date of the foundation of Holme Cultran	171
22.	On Godred Olaveson's relations with Norway, and his troubles at home	171
23.	On the chronology of events during Godred's reign	175
24.	On the division of the kingdom of the Isles	176

NOTE		PAGE
25.	Who is St. Machutus?	177
26.	On Somerled's expedition against Malcolm; and Godred's contest with Reginald	177
27.	Chronology of the coronation of the son of King Henry II.	178
28.	On Cardinal Vivian's mission	178
29.	Chronological error in the entry 1182-3; and on the title of Viscount of Man	179
30.	Arrangements between Reginald and Olave; Reginald's connection with the affairs of Orkney	179
31.	On Reginald's relations with Norway, England, and the Pope	184
32.	On the name Scristina, and on Ferquhard Mac Intagart, Earl of Ross	188
33.	Who was Páll Bálkason?	189
34.	Who was Alan of Galloway?	189
35.	On Bishop Simon's mission to Bergen	190
36.	On the attempted mediation of England between Olave and Reginald	190
37.	Expedition from Norway to the Isles and Man in 1230-1231; and on the three parts into which the kingdom was divided	190
38.	Subsequent division of the kingdom between Olave and Godred Don, and its reunion on Godred's death	197
39.	Chronology of the death of Olave	198
40.	On Harold's journey to Norway	198
41.	Who is Gilchrist?	199
42.	On Harold's journey to England and Norway in 1246-47	199
43.	On the death of Simon	200
44.	On the chronology and topography of the death of Harold, and on the visit of two grandsons of Somerled to Norway	200
45.	On the murder of Reginald	203
46.	Conflicting claims of Norway and Scotland with respect to Man and the Isles	203
47.	On Harold's summons to Norway in 1250	205
48.	Relations between Magnus, and John son of Dugald	206
49.	Parties in the contest in Man in 1251	206
50.	On Magnus Olaveson's journey to Norway in 1253	206
51.	His visit to Henry of England	207
52.	Conflicting claims of Scotland and Norway—campaign of 1263—battle of Largs—cession of Man and the Isles to Scotland, 1266	207
53.	Scottish expedition to Man of 1275. Extinction of male line of Godred—female line continued through Affreca	232
54.	Chronological difficulties relative to the episcopal succession of the bishops of Man and the Sudreys	234
55.	Where is Jerewos?	243

NOTE PAGE

56. On the episcopate of Bishop Simon and the manner of appointing to the vacant See 243
57. On the vacancy of the See after Simon's death, and the appointment of Richard 248
58. On Bishop Mark and his troubles 249
59. On the four next bishops mentioned in the Chronicle . . 251
60. On the appointment of Bishop Russell; the erection of a Franciscan monastery 252
61. Chronology of the death of Bishop Russell . . . 255
62. On the appointment of Bishop Duncan 255
63. On the duration of the subjection of the See to the Archbishop of Drontheim 257

END OF VOL. I.

Printed by R. & R. Clark, *Edinburgh.*

3 2044 050 496 306